

लौकिकन्यायाञ्जलिः ॥

A HANDFUL OF POPULAR MAXIMS

CURRENT IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE,

COLLECTED BY

Colonel G. A. Jacob,

INDIAN STAFF CORPS.



PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

BY

TUKÂRÂM JÂVAJÎ,

PROPRIETOR OF JAVAJI DADAJI'S "NIRNAYA-SAGAR" PRESS.

Bombay.

1900.

[All rights reserved by the Publisher.]

Price 6 Annas.

OIE: 120

III DO-1

11213

Registered under Act XXV of 1867.

PREFACE.

IN Dr. Bühler's well-known Kashmir Report of 1877, we read the following:—A curious and very useful though modern treatise is the *Laukikanyāyasamgraha* of Raghunātha, a Rajput. This worthy has collected the *nyāyas* or 'inferences from familiar instances,' which occur in the *S'āstras*, especially those from the *Vedāntas'āstra*, e. g. *Danḍāpūpikānyāya*, *Dehalī-dīpanyāya* &c. The collection is not complete, but contains a good deal more than that Professor Bālas'āstri has given in his article in the *Pandit*.* P. Vāmanāchārya Jhalkīkar is at present engaged on a still more extensive work on this subject, which will comprise about 900 such *nyāyas*." Page 76.

The information given in the concluding sentence raised our hopes to a high pitch, for the need of such a work was great, and Bālas'āstri had explained only nine of those *nyāyas*. But alas! 'there's many a slip between the cup and lip,' and though we have waited for this "more extensive work" for 22 long years, there are still no signs of its appearing.

I have therefore determined to lay before the public the 'handful' of popular maxims which I have collected during many years of reading, in the hope that they may become the nucleus of a very much larger collection. In Tārānātha Tarkavāchaspati's *Vācaspatyam* we have a list of 151 *nyāyas*, popular and technical; but references to works where they are to be found are few and far between, and this considerably lessens their value. Thirty of these were reproduced in V. S. Āpte's dictionary, in 1890, but with the same defect. Again, in 1875, Pandit Satyavrata Sāmas'rami published a small pamphlet of 36 popular maxims together with a larger number of purely technical ones,

* October and December 1867.

and professed to give a reference for each of them. But a man who refers you to the "Bhāgavata Purāṇa," to "A commentary on the Vedāntabhāṣya," or to "A commentary on the Kāvya-prakāśa," and vouchsafes no further information whatever, is a worthless guide; and such mere semblance of guidance deserves nothing but reprobation. One can tolerate ambiguity of this kind in the ancient writings: but in modern times, when printed books of reference abound, such vagueness is inexcusable.

My list comprises only 'popular' maxims, and therefore such purely technical ones as *adhyāropanyāya*, *kaimutikanyāya*, *gunopasamhārananyāya*, and others of a similar nature, which abound in the philosophical and grammatical works, will not be found here. Moreover, I have rigorously excluded even popular maxims which I have been unable to find *in actual use in the literature*, deeming an unverified maxim with a mere dictionary-existence, as of very little value. Doubtless *all* those given in our dictionaries do exist somewhere in the literature, and if any scholars can furnish references for those given below which have defied my efforts to trace them, I shall be very grateful. I may add that about 22 illustrative sayings, which are practically *nyāyas*, might be gathered from the fourth Book of the *Sāṅkhyasūtras*; such as, for example, the well-known "अहिनिर्वृयनीवत्" and others more or less useful. Some of them were published in the *Pandit* for December 1876, under the title of "Stories illustrative of the Sāṅkhya doctrine;" but the whole will be found translated in the volume of "Sāṅkhya Aphorisms" published in Trübner's Oriental Series.

**List of Popular Maxims found in the Dictionaries,
but which I have not been able
to trace elsewhere.**

A = Âpte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary. S = Satyavrata Sâma-
s'rami's *Nyâyâvali*. V = Târânâtha's *Vâcaspatyam*.

अन्धगजन्यायः ॥ V.

The maxim of *the blind men and the elephant*. A number of blind men desired to form an idea of the shape of an elephant. One touched his trunk and thought he must be like a snake; another took hold of a leg and supposed that he was like a post, and so on. Târânâtha tells us that it is used to illustrate the divergence of views held by the ignorant in regard to Îs'vara. In that case, it is not likely to be much in use. S. quotes it under the form अन्धहस्ति°, and gives as a reference भागवतादयः!

अन्धचटकन्यायः ॥ A. V.

The maxim of *the blind man and the sparrow*. Equivalent to अन्धकवर्तकीयन्याय. No reference.

अशोकवनिकान्यायः ॥ A. S. V.

The maxim of *the grove of As'oka trees*. "Râvana kept Sitâ in the grove of As'oka trees, but it is not easy to account for his preference of that particular grove to any other one; so when a man finds several ways of doing a thing, any one of them may be considered as good as another, and the preference

of any particular one cannot be accounted for." A. For the Aśoka-grove see *Rāmāyana* 1. 1. 73. S. gives भाष्यसप्तमसूत्र-व्याख्या as a reference for the maxim.

आम्रवणन्यायः ॥ V.

The maxim of the mango-wood. "वने इतरवृक्षसत्त्वेऽपि आम्राणां बाहुल्ये यथाम्रवणव्यपदेश एवमेकस्य प्राधान्ये 'भूयस्त्वात्तद्वाद' इति न्यायेन तद्व्यपदेशो यत्र तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ No reference.

उपवासाद्वरं भैक्ष्यम् ॥ V.

It is better to live on alms than to fast. Perhaps equivalent to our 'of two evils, choose the least.' No reference.

उष्ट्रकण्टकभक्षणन्यायः ॥ S. V.

The maxim of a camel's eating thorns. "उष्ट्रस्य शमीकण्टकवेधजातदुःखकालेऽपि शमीपत्रभक्षणसुखलेशो यथा तथाभीष्टविषयोपार्जनदुःखकाले तदुपार्जितद्रव्यजसुखलेशो यत्रोपदिश्यते तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ V. I regard this explanation as quite beside the mark. S. gives as reference वेदान्तशंकरभाष्यटीका, and this may possibly mean Ānandagiri on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2. 2. 1. S'ankara, after combating at length the Sāṅkhya theory, that objects are in themselves सुखदुःखमोहात्मक, says:—"शब्दाद्यविशेषेऽपि च भावनाविशेषात्सुखादिविशेषोपलब्धेः," which Dr. Thibaut renders—"And, further, although the sense-object, such as sound and so on, is one, yet we observe that owing to the difference of the mental impressions (produced by it) differences exist in the effects it produces, one person being affected by it pleasantly, another painfully, and so on." On which Ānandagiri says:—"शब्दादीति । भावना तत्तज्जातियोग्या वासना तद्विशेषादुष्टादीनां कण्टकादौ सुखादिदर्शनात् &c." Vācaspatiśra, explains the same passage in the *Bhāmati*, (pp. 380-1), pointing out that things are not in themselves essentially pleasant

or unpleasant, and that what causes pleasure to one may be painful to another, and that even the same thing which at one time is agreeable may at another time be the reverse. Otherwise thorns would be as acceptable to men as they are to a camel. Here are his words:—“यदि पुनरेत एव सुखदुःखस्वभावा भवेयुस्ततः स्वरूपत्वाद्धेमन्तेपि चन्दनः सुखः स्यात् । नहि चन्दनः कदाचिदचन्दनः । तथा निदाघेष्वपि कुंकुमपंकः सुखोभवेत् । नह्यसौ कदाचिदकुंकुमपंकः । एवं कण्टकः क्रमेण लकस्य सुख इति मनुष्यादीनामपि प्राणभृतां सुखः स्यात् । नह्यसौ कांश्चित्प्रत्येवाकण्टक्* इति । तस्मादसुखादिस्वभावा अपि चन्दनकुंकुमादयो जातिकालावस्थापेक्षया सुखदुःखादिहेतवो न तु स्वयं सुखादिस्वभावा इति रमणीयम्”.

A camel, then, eats thorns because it likes them; a man does not eat them because he does not like them. May not the maxim, therefore, be the equivalent of our “*What's one man's food is another man's poison?*” To talk about the pain experienced by a camel whilst eating thorns, is simply rubbish!

ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्यायः ॥ S.

The maxim of the *Brāhmanas and Vasishtha*. This is of exactly the same type as ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय, which see. S. gives as a reference “हलन्त्यं-सूत्रभाष्यं,” i. e. Patanjali on *Pāṇini* 1. 3. 3. But the reference is a pure delusion; and I think I may safely say that the maxim is not to be found in any part of the *Mahābhāṣya*. It would not be unreasonable, however, to infer that the author of the *Padamanjari* had this nyāya in view when he penned the following:—“वैदिकानां लौकिकत्वेऽपि प्राधान्यख्यापनार्थं पृथग्रहणं यथा ब्राह्मणा आगता वसिष्ठोऽप्यागत इति” ॥ (*The Pandit*, vol. x, page 282).

* The printed text wrongly reads कण्टक.

better quality. But, what there is has been put together in defiance of the warnings of the skilful oculist in whose hands I have been for the last five years, and therefore at some risk to failing sight. May some younger scholar be provoked to the good work of giving us something fuller and better.

Redhill, Surrey. }
July 1900.

G. A. J.

अजाकृपाणीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the she-goat and the sword*. It is founded on some story of a goat's being suddenly killed by accidental contact with a sword, and is used to illustrate any surprising event happening altogether by chance. It therefore belongs to the same class as काकतालीय, खल्वाटबिल्वीय and others of a similar kind. An excellent illustration of its use—and, indeed, the only one that I have met with—is found on page 229 of S'riharsha's *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*:—“पाणौ पञ्च वराटकान्पिधाय कश्चित्पृच्छति कति वराटका इति । पृष्टश्चाजाकृपाणीयन्यायेन ब्रवीति पञ्चेति” ॥ In a footnote the maxim is thus explained:—“कण्डूयनार्थं स्तंभादौ शिथिलबन्ध-खङ्गे छागी ग्रीवां प्रसारयति यदच्छया च ग्रीवा छिद्यते तथाभूतोऽजाकृपाणीयन्यायः काकतालीयन्यायसमः” ॥ Vardhamāna puts it differently in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhī* iii. 196 (Prof. Eggeling's edition):—“यथाजया भूमिं खनन्यात्मवधाय कृपाणो दर्शितस्तत्तुल्यं वृत्तं केनचिदात्मविनाशाय कृतमजाकृपाणीयम्” ॥ For another variety, see *Padamanjari* on *Kāś'ikā* 5. 3. 106.

Dr. Goldstücker ignored Indian tradition in his explanation of the adjective अजाकृपाणीय, which reads thus:—“As in the fable of the goat and the *shears*, viz. approached unreflectingly.” The abridged St. Petersburg Lexicon, too, has rejected the *sword* in favour of the *shears*.

It is interesting to note that the Marāṭhī-speaking folk of Western India have adopted the maxim, but with a changed meaning. Molesworth defines it as “The maxim of the sword upon the neck of the goat. Expressive of meekness and absolute helplessness.”



अन्तर्दीपिकान्यायः ॥

The Maxim of a lamp in a central position. Applied to something which fulfils a double purpose. It occurs in S'ankara's bhâshya on the *Mundaka Upanishad* 3. 1. 5. ("सत्येन लभ्यस्तपसा ह्येष आत्मा सम्यग्ज्ञानेन ब्रह्मचर्येण नित्यम्" ।) on which he says:— "नित्यं सर्वदा । नित्यं सत्येन नित्यं तपसा नित्यं सम्यग्ज्ञानेनेति सर्वत्र नित्यशब्दोऽन्तर्दीपिकान्यायेनानुषक्तव्यः" ॥ It is akin to देहलीदीपन्याय and मध्यदीपन्याय. Jivânanda's edition of the *Mundakabhâshya* wrongly reads अन्यदीपकन्यायेन. The reading given above is from the Ânandâs'ram edition.

अन्धकवर्तकीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the blind man and the quail. Like अजा-कृपाणीय and many others, it is used to express a wholly fortuitous occurrence. Vardhamâna, on *Ganaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195, explains it thus:—"अन्धकश्च वर्तका च अन्धकवर्तकम् । अन्धकस्य वर्तकाया उपर्यतर्कितः पादन्यास उच्यते । तत्तुल्यमन्धकवर्तकीयम्" ॥ This authority brings the quail under the blind man's foot; but the commentator S'rîs'rutasâgara, who expounded the work *Yas'astilaka*,* and who in the colophon is described as "तर्कन्याकरण-छन्दोलंकारसिद्धान्तसाहित्यादिशास्त्रनिपुणमतिः प्राकृतव्याकरणाद्यनेकशास्त्रचर्चना-चुञ्चुः", brings the bird into the man's hands. And, surely, such a prodigy of learning must be right! The verse in which the expression अन्धकवर्तकीय occurs is *Yas'astilaka* ii. 153. "संसार-सागरमिमं भ्रमता नितान्तं जीवेन मानवभवः समवापि दैवात् । तत्रापि यद्भुवन-मान्यकुले प्रसूतिः सत्सङ्गतिश्च तदिहान्धकवर्तकीयम्" ॥ "It is altogether by chance that a soul wandering about in this ocean of repeated births is born as a man; and that he should be born into a family of repute in the world, and enjoy the society of the good, is likewise as accidental as in the case of the blind man and the

* This important work, described by Dr. Peterson at considerable length in his Second Report published in 1884, is now appearing in the *Kavyamâlâ*, a valuable periodical issued by the Proprietor of the Nirṇayasâgar Press.

ताडयन्वर्तते तस्य करद्वयमध्ये वर्तकः पक्षिविशेषः समायाति स तु दुर्लभस्तथा मानवभवे सत्सङ्गतिर्दुर्लभा वर्तते ” ॥

अन्धगोलाङ्गलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the blind man and the cow's tail*. The story is that an evil-disposed fellow found a blind man wandering helplessly about having lost his way. Expressing great sympathy for him, and promising to help him, the man led him to a young and frisky cow, and putting her tail into his hand told him to hold on, and that she would certainly lead him to the village to which he wished to go. The result was, of course, most disastrous.

S'ankara, in his bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 1. 1. 7, applies the maxim to the case of a teacher who instructs one anxious for emancipation that the unintelligent Pradhâna of the Sâmkhyas is the Self, and so leads his pupil to destruction! These are his words:—“यदि चाज्ञस्य सतो मुमुक्षोरचेतनमात्मानमात्मेत्युपदिशेत्प्रमाणभूतं शास्त्रं स श्रद्धानतयाभ्यगोलाङ्गलन्यायेन तदात्मदृष्टिं न परित्यजेत्तद्व्यतिरिक्तं चात्मानं न प्रतिपद्येत । तथा सति पुरुषार्थाद्विहिन्येतानर्थं च ऋच्छेत्” ॥

अन्धपरम्परान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a continuous series of blind men*. It would seem to be in this sense that S'ankarâchârya uses it in his *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 2. 2. 30, 37. The passages stand thus:—“अनादित्वेऽप्यन्धपरम्परान्यायेनाप्रतिष्ठैवानवस्था व्यवहारलोपिनी स्यान्नाभिप्राय-सिद्धिः” । “वर्तमानकालवदतीतेष्वपि कालेष्वितरेतराश्रयदोषाविशेषादन्धपरम्परान्यायापत्तेः” ॥ In his rendering of the former passage, Dr. Thibaut has overlooked the maxim, but the latter he translates as follows:—“For in past time as well as in the present, mutual



interdependence of the two took place, so that the beginningless series is like *an endless chain of blind men leading other blind men*." I should add that, in the former case, S'ankara is arguing against the Buddhist theory of a beginningless series of mental impressions, and, in the latter, against the Sāṅkhya notion of a similar chain of human actions and divine interpositions. Dr. Thibaut's explanation of the maxim is quite in accord with that of Dr. Garbe in his rendering of the *Sāṅkhya-sūtra* iii. 81 "इतरथान्धपरम्परा" "Else there would be a tradition [comparable to a row] of blind men [leading each other]."

A very apt quotation from one of Coleridge's *Lay Sermons* is given in that useful work *A Rational Refutation of Hindu Philosophical Systems* (now quite out of print), from which I extract the following:—"The old man talked much and vehemently concerning an infinite series of causes and effects, which he explained to be a string of blind men, the last of whom caught hold of the skirt of the one before him, he of the next, and so on till they were all out of sight; and that they all walked infallibly straight, without making one false step, though all were alike blind. Methought I borrowed courage from surprise, and asked him, 'Who, then, is at the head to guide them?' He looked at me with ineffable contempt, not unmixed with an angry suspicion, and then replied, 'No one; the string of blind men goes on for ever without any beginning: for although one blind man cannot move without stumbling, yet infinite blindness supplies the want of sight.'"

In the opening part of the *Padamañjarī* (*Pandit* x. 248) we find the expression *अन्धपरम्पराप्रसङ्ग* used with reference to testimony received through a series of blind men, and therefore of doubtful value. For the passage, see Addenda.

Âpte defines *अन्धपरम्परान्याय* as "The maxim of the blind following the blind. It is used in those cases where people blindly or thoughtlessly follow others, not caring to see whether

अरुन्धतीप्रदर्शनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the pointing out of the star *Arundhati*. Its usage is explained by S'ankara in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 1. 1. 8, as follows:—“यथारुन्धतीं दिदर्शयिषुस्तत्समीपस्थां स्थूलां ताराममुख्यां प्रथममरुन्धतीति ग्राहयित्वा तां प्रत्याख्याय पश्चादरुन्धतीमेव ग्राहयति तद्वन्नायमात्मेति ब्रूयात्” ॥ Similarly, too, in 1. 1. 12, we read:—“यथारुन्धतीनिदर्शने बह्वीष्वपि तारास्वमुख्यास्वरुन्धतीषु दर्शितासु यान्त्या प्रदर्श्यते सा मुख्यैवारुन्धती भवत्येवमिहाप्यानन्दमयस्य सर्वान्तरत्वान्मुख्यमात्मत्वम्” ॥ The maxim is sometimes styled *स्थूलारुन्धतीन्याय*, and it appears under this name in Nṛsiṃhasarasvatī's commentary on section 20 of the *Vedānta-sāra*—that section which gives the views of Chârâkas and others as to the *âtman*. See Addenda also.

अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् ॥

If one can find honey on the Arka-tree [close at hand], then why go to the mountain for it? That is, if an object can be accomplished by simple means, don't adopt a more complicated method. This is well illustrated by S'ankara in his *Vedānta-sūtrabhāṣya* 3. 4. 3, as follows:—“केवलाच्चेज्ज्ञानात्पुरुषार्थसिद्धिः स्यात्किमर्थमनेकायाससमन्वितानि कर्माणि ते कुर्युः । अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेदिति न्यायात्” ॥

So, too, S'abara on *Jaimini* 1. 2. 4. Here, the *pūrvapakṣin*, after taking exception to certain Vedic injunctions as useless, says:—“तद्यथा पथिजातेऽर्के मधूत्सृज्य तेनैव पथा मध्वर्थिनः पर्वतं न गच्छेयुस्तादृशं हि तत् । अपि चाहुः । अर्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् । इष्टस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धौ को विद्वान्यत्तमाचरेत्” ॥ The same couplet is quoted by Vāchaspati Miśra in his *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* 1., except that (in Tārānātha's edition of 1871) he reads “इष्टस्यार्थस्य” in the second line. The editor also gives अर्के as a variant of अर्के, and explains it by गृहकोणे.



अर्धजरतीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the *semi-senile woman*. It is very difficult to fix on the exact force of this saying. Authorities differ so much as to make it almost an instance of *quot homines tot sententiae*. As expounded by Vardhamâna (iii. 195) it seems to imply *indefiniteness, half-and-half-ness, the being neither one thing nor the other*. He says :—“यथा स्त्री न तरुणी श्रुत्यस्तनत्वात् कृशकेश-त्वान्न जरती वक्तुं शक्यते तद्वत्सिद्धासिद्धं प्रयोजनम्” ॥ This seems to accord with the meaning assigned to it by Marâthas, as shown by Molesworth in his Marâthî dictionary, where he defines it as “Action of indeterminate character; speech vague and indefinite; a proceeding void of decided leaning or bearing.”

The maxim is cited by S'ankara in *Brahmasûtrabhâṣya* 1. 1. 19, and again in 1. 2. 8. In the former, after quoting *Taittirîya-upanishad* ii. 1-4 in regard to अन्नरसमय, प्राणमय &c., he says :—“इति विकारार्थे मयदप्रवाहे सत्यानन्दमय एवाकस्मादर्धजरतीयन्यायेन कथमिव मयटः प्राचुर्यार्थत्वं ब्रह्मविषयत्वं वाश्रीयत इति” ॥ The commentators Ânandagiri and Râmananda (erroneously styled Govindânanda*) ignore the maxim entirely, and so does Dr. Thibaut in his translation. In the second instance, S'ankara says :—“यथाशास्त्रं तर्हि शास्त्रीयोऽर्थः प्रतिपत्तव्यो न तत्रार्धजरतीयं लभ्यम्,” which is rendered by Dr. Thibaut, “Very well, then, it appears that the truth about scriptural matters is to be ascertained from scripture, and that *scripture is not sometimes to be appealed to, and on other occasions to be disregarded*.” Ânandagiri's comment is :—“नहि कुक्कुटादेरेकदेशो भोगाय पच्यत एकदेशस्तु प्रसवाय कल्प्यते विरोधात्,” “You cannot take one part of a fowl for cooking and leave the other part to lay eggs;” that is, you must take a thing in its entirety, or else leave it altogether. Râmananda, on the other hand, says :—“अर्धं मुखमात्रं जरत्या वृद्धयाः कामयते नाङ्गानीति सोऽयमर्धजरतीयन्यायः स चात्र न युक्तः,” which seems to be

* See Dr. Fitzedward Hall's *Index*, page 90.

based on Patanjali's words "न चेदानीमर्धजरतीयं लभ्यं... । तद्यथा । अर्धं जरत्याः कामयतेऽर्धं नेति", as found in *Mahābhāṣya* 4. 1. 78.* Lastly, we find the maxim in the Bauddha section of *Sarva-dars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind.; and 17 of Jivānanda's edn.), which reads thus:—"न चार्धजरतीयमुचितम् । न हि कुकुब्धा एको भागः पाकायापरो भागः प्रसवाय कल्प्यतामिति कल्प्यते", and which is identical with Ānandagiri's exposition. Prof. Gough, who translated this chapter, rendered the maxim by "semi-effete"—"Nor is a semi-effete existence admissible."

अशक्तोऽहं गृहारम्भे शक्तोऽहं गृहभञ्जने ॥

I am too weak to construct a house, but I am well able to destroy one. This is found in Dhunḍhirāja's commentary on *Mudrārākṣha* iii. 11. Chānakya says—"कथं स्पृहते मया सह दुरात्मा राक्षसः" । and then follows the verse "कृतागाः कौटिल्यो मुजग इव निर्याय नगरात् &c.", on which Dhunḍhirāja remarks:—"ममेव नास्य बुद्धिबलं परंतु मत्सरमात्रेण अशक्तोऽहं गृहारम्भे शक्तोऽहं गृहभञ्जन इति न्यायेन मौर्यापकारमात्राय प्रयतमानः सन्केवलं पौरुषबलमवष्टभ्य मदुद्धेः प्रकर्ष-मतिशयितुं व्यवसित इत्यहो राक्षसस्य दुर्व्यवसितमिति" ॥ I am indebted for this passage to the learned Librarian at the India Office, C. H. Tawney Esqr.

अस्त्रमस्त्रेण शाम्यति ॥

A weapon is silenced by a weapon. Perhaps analogous to the saying "Like cures like," or, "Set a thief to catch a thief." It occurs in Jñānottama's commentary on Sures'vara's *Naish-karmyasiddhi* i. 81, where he says:—"नन्वस्त्रमस्त्रेण शाम्यतीति न्यायेन काम्यैः काम्यानां निषिद्धैर्निषिद्धानां निवृत्तिरस्त्वित्यत आह न च काम्यैरिति" ॥

* Vol. ii. page 231 of the edition by Dr. F. Kielhorn, who himself most kindly gave me the reference.

अहिकुण्डलन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the snake and its coils*. The expression occurs in *Brahmasūtra* 3. 2. 27, and is explained in the *bhāṣya*. They read thus:—“उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वाहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ ...अत उभयव्यपदेशदर्शनादहिकुण्डलवदत्र तत्त्वं भवितुमर्हति । यथाहिरित्यभेदः कुण्डलाभोगांप्रांशुत्वादीनीति च भेद एवमिहापीति” ॥ Dr. Thibaut's translation is as follows:—“But on account of twofold designation, (the relation of the highest Self to the individual soul has to be viewed) like that of the snake to its coils.....We therefore look on the relation of the highest Self and the soul as analogous to that of the snake and its coils. Viewed as a whole the snake is one, non-different, while an element of difference appears if we view it with regard to its coils, hood, erect posture and so on.” It is akin therefore to the expressions “a forest and its trees,” “a lake and its waters,” so often used by the Vedantists as illustrations of identity. The explanation given by Tārānātha in the *Vāchaspatyam* does not coincide with the above. He says:—“अहेः सर्पस्य यथा कुण्डलाकृतिवेष्टनं स्वाभाविकं तथा यस्य स्वाभाविकधर्मो व्यपदिश्यते तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः ” ॥

आकाशमुष्टिहननन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *striking the sky with one's fist*. A vain attempt at an impossibility. It occurs in the Jaimini chapter of *Sarvādars'anasangraha* (page 133 of *Bib. Ind.* edition, and p. 151 of Jivānanda's) as follows:—“तस्मादुत्पत्तौ ज्ञसौ च परतस्त्वे प्रमाणसंभवात्स्वतःसिद्धं प्रामाण्यमित्येतत्पूतिकुष्माण्डायत इति चेत्तदेतदाकाशमुष्टिहननायते” ॥ Prof. Cowell has rendered it thus:—“Therefore, as we can prove that authoritativeness is both produced and recognized by means of something external, the Mīmāṃsā tenet ‘authoritativeness is self-proved’ is like a gourd over-ripe and rotten. This long harangue of our opponent, however, is but a vain attempt to strike the sky with his fist.”

The appearance or disappearance of a quality (or characteristic) produces a corresponding change in the subject of it. Although this is included in Tārānātha's list of nyāyas, it ought not, strictly speaking, to find a place amongst popular maxims; but I insert it in order to make a necessary correction in the printed text of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha* where it is quoted. On page 161 of the Bibliotheca Indica edition, and on page 182 of that prepared by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, we read “ततश्चोपपन्नस्त्वयन्धर्मो विकरोति हि धर्मिणमिति न्यायेन” and this bad reading of course affects the translation as it appears on page 244 of the volume prepared for Trübner's Oriental Series by Professors Cowell and Gough. The maxim is correctly quoted on page 232 of *Advaitabrahmasiddhi* (Bib. Indica Series, Calc. 1890). The explication given in *Vāchaspatyam* is as follows:—“यथा पूर्वस्य रूपसादिरूपधर्मपरावृत्तौ रूपसाद्यन्तरोत्पत्तौ च घटादेर्धर्मिणो विकृतिरेवं यस्य धर्मिणः पूर्वधर्मस्यापगमेऽन्यधर्मस्योत्पत्तिस्तत्रायं न्यायोऽवतरति” ॥ Will not one of our Bombay Sanskritists give us an accurate edition of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*? It is much needed.

एकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवते ॥

Whilst seeking for one thing he loses another. The saying appears twice, in this form, in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*. The first instance is in the Ārḥata Section (p. 27, of Bib. Ind. and 33 of Jivānanda's edn.), translated by Professor Cowell:—“एतद्दोषपरिजिहीर्षया ज्ञानं जडतां नानुकरोतीति ब्रूषे हन्त तर्हि तस्या ग्रहणं न स्यादित्येकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवत इति न्यायापातः” । “If, in your wish to escape this difficulty, you assert that ‘the perception does not follow the object in being insentient,’ then there would be no perception that the object is insentient, and so it is a case of the proverb, ‘While he looks for one thing which he has lost, another drops.’”



The second example, from the Akshapâda section (pp. 118 and 134), is as follows:—"नन्वेकमनुसन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवत इति न्यायेन दुःखवत्सुखमित्युच्छिद्यत इत्यकाम्योऽयं पक्ष इति चेन्मैवं मंस्थाः" ।

"Nor may you retort on us that we have fulfilled the proverb of '*seeking one thing and dropping another in the search*,' since we have abolished happiness as being ever tainted with some incidental pain &c."

In the *Khaṇḍanakhāṇḍakhāḍya* (page 447 of the reprint from the *Pandit*) we meet with the proverb in another form, namely "एकं सन्धित्सतोऽपरं प्रच्यवते" which means " Whilst trying to reunite one [piece of a broken vessel] another falls off." The application would be the same as before.

कदम्बकोरकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the buds of the Kadamba tree*. They are said to burst forth simultaneously. In the *Bhâshâparichcheda* (verse 166) this is given as an illustration of the way in which sound is produced. The verse reads thus:—

वीचित्ररङ्गन्यायेन तदुत्पत्तिस्तु कीर्तिता ।

कदम्बकोरकन्यायादुत्पत्तिः कस्यचिन्मते ॥

The commentary, *Siddhântamuktâvali*, however, explains कदम्बगोलकन्यायात् and this is the form given to the maxim in the *Vachaspathyam* which explains it as follows:—"कदम्बगोलकस्य गोलाकारकदम्बस्य सर्वावयवेषु यथा युगपत्सुषोऽहम् एवं सर्वप्रदेशेषु युगपद्यत्र प्रसरत्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ In Vedantin Mahâdeva's comment on *Sâmkhyasûtra* V. 103, we have a third form, namely कदम्बमुकुलन्याय. See Dr. R. Garbe's fine edition, of 1888.

कफोणिगुडन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *treacle on the elbow*. Used of something tantalizingly inaccessible. In the Akshapâda chapter of *Sarvadarśa-*

nasangraha (page 116 of Bib. Indica, and 132 of Jīvananda's edition) we read :—"ननु दुःखात्यन्तोच्छेदोऽपवर्ग इत्येतदद्यापि कफोणिगुडायितं वर्तते तत्कथं सिद्धवत्कृत्य व्यवहियत इति चेन्मैवम्" ॥ which Prof. Cowell translates as follows:—"But is not your definition of the *summum bonum*, liberation, that is, the absolute abolition of pain, after all as much beyond our reach as *treacle on the elbow is to the tongue*; why then is this continually put forth as if it were established beyond all dispute?" In a footnote he says, "Compare the English proverb 'As soon as the cat can lick her ear.'" In the *Vāchaspatyam*, however, the *nyāya* is explained as meaning the *absence* of a thing, not its inaccessibility. It says:—"कफोणौ गुडाभावेऽपि तदाशया यथा लेहनमेवं यत्र वस्त्वसद्भावेऽपि तत्प्रत्याशया व्यापारभेदस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः" ॥ And the St. Petersburg Lexicon (s. v. कफोणिगुडाय्) renders it "like a *ball* on the elbow."

काकतालीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the crow and the Palmyra fruit. A crow alighted on a Palmyra tree, and at the same moment some of the fruit fell on its head and killed it. The maxim is therefore used to illustrate a startling and *purely accidental* occurrence. It is well explained in the *Kāś'ikāvṛitti* on *Pāṇini* 5. 3. 106 (as quoted by Dr. Eggeling in a footnote to *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* iii. 195):—"काकतालीयम् । अजाकृपाणीयम् । अन्धकर्तृकीयम् । अतर्कितोपनतं चित्रीकरणमुच्यते । तत्कथम् । काकस्यागमनं यादृच्छिकं तालस्य पतनं च । तेन तालेन पतता काकस्य वधः कृतः । एवमेव देवदत्तस्य तत्रागमनं दस्यूनां चोपनिपातः । तैश्च तस्य वधः कृतः । तत्र यो देवदत्तस्य दस्यूनां च समागमः स काकतालसमागमसदृशः" ॥

We find the saying in *Pañchadas'ī* ix. 12 as follows:—"अथावस्तुविज्ञानात्फलं लभ्यत ईप्सितम् । काकतालीयतः सोऽयं संवादिभ्रम उच्यते" ॥ Also in *Subhāshitāvalī* 401 (Dr. Peterson's edition):—"साधयति तद्वयोजनमज्ञस्तस्य काकतालीयम् । दैवात्कथमप्यक्षरमुत्किरति धुणोऽपि काष्ठेषु" ॥ And again in Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyā-*

loka ii. 16. In his commentary on *S'antiparva* clxxvii. 11, Nīlakaṇṭha Govind gives another, and very improbable, definition of the maxim. He says:—"तालः करतलयोः शब्दजनकः संयोगस्मिन् क्रियमाणे उत्पत्तिकाको दैवात्तत्र तालाभ्यामाक्रान्तोऽभूत्तदेतत्काकतालीयमित्युच्यते । काकस्पर्शसमकालं तालफलस्य तालवृक्षस्य वा पतनं तदित्यन्ये" ॥ The Marāṭhī Pandits in adopting the nyāya have changed its meaning. Molesworth explains it thus:—"Said when any occurrence synchronizing with, or immediately following, some other seems, however in truth independent of it, to have been occasioned by it;—as the fruit of a Palmyra falling at the alighting upon it of a crow, may appear to fall in consequence."

काकदन्तपरीक्षान्यायः ॥

The maxim of the examination of a crow's teeth. Used of any useless and manifestly fruitless enquiry. It occurs in S'ankara's bhāṣya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* i. 25 ["नचिकेतो मरणं मानुप्राक्षीः"]:—"नचिकेतो मरणं मरणसंबद्धं प्रश्नं प्रेत्यास्ति नास्तीति काकदन्तपरीक्षारूपं मानुप्राक्षीमैवं प्रष्टुमर्हसि" ॥ We find it also in Abhinavagupta on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 19 (page 163 of Paṇḍit Durgāprasāda's edition) as follows:—"व्यंग्योऽर्थो भवतु मा वा भूत् कस्तत्रामिनिवेशः । काकदन्तपरीक्षाप्रायमेव तत्स्यादिति भावः" ॥ Again, on the first page of the *Nyāyavārtikatātparyatīkā* (Benares, 1898), there is the expression "काकदन्तपरीक्षाग्रन्थसाधारण्येन" ॥ The saying occurs also in the form काकदन्तविचार. We find it thus in *Jaiminīya-Nyāyamālavastara* 4. 1. 1:—"ऋत्वर्थोऽयं पुरुषार्थोऽयमिति विवेकस्य प्रयोजनं किमपि न पश्यामः । तस्मात्काकदन्तविचारवदयं विचार उपेक्षणीय इति चेन्मैवम्" ॥ Also in the *Khaṇḍamakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 84:—"न च वाच्यं सामान्यतोऽद्वैतप्रमाणसिद्धौ भूतायामपि विशेषतः प्रमाणप्रभो, यतः सामान्यसिद्धावेवाद्वैतसिद्धौ विशेषविचारः काकदन्तविचारवत्स्यात्" ॥

काकाक्षिगोलकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the crow's eyeball. Crows are popularly supposed to have only one eye, which, as occasion requires, moves

from the cavity on one side into that on the other. The maxim is used of a word which appears only once in a sentence but which applies to two portions of it; or of persons or things fulfilling a double purpose. I have met with it in the former sense in Svâtmârâm's *Hathayogapradîpikâ* iv. 10, “विविधैरासनेः कुम्भैर्विचित्रैः करणैरपि,” on which the commentator, Brahmananda, says “विचित्रैरिति काकाक्षिगोलकन्यायेनोभयत्र संबध्यते.” Also in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyâlôka* iii. 1, “पदानां स्मारकत्वेऽपि पदमात्रावभासिनः” where he remarks “अपिशब्दः काकाक्षिन्यायेनोभयत्रापि संबध्यते” ॥ Of its use in the second sense, we have an interesting example in Kâmandaki's *Nîtisâra*, a work ascribed to the third century before Christ. Chapter xi. 24 reads thus:—“वलिनोर्द्विषतोर्मध्ये वाचात्मानं समर्पयन् । द्वैधीभावेन वर्त्तते काकाक्षिवदलक्षितः” ॥ The maxim may be said to approximate the English one of “Killing two birds with one stone.”

काशकुशावलम्बनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *catching at straws*. The being driven to an argument or position wholly untenable. Târânâtha says:—“नद्यादौ पतितस्य संतरणानभिज्ञस्य यथा कुशकाशावलम्बनं निरर्थकमेवं प्रबल्युक्तिषु निराकृतासु दुर्बलयुक्त्यवलम्बनं निरर्थकमित्येवमवलम्बनस्य निरर्थकत्वविवक्षायामस्य प्रवृत्तिः” ॥ The expression “काशकुशावलम्बनकल्पं” occurs in the Ârhatta chapter (p. 25 of Bib. Ind. and p. 31 of Jivânanda's edition) of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, and again in the Pânini chapter (pp. 142 and 161); and in both places Prof. Cowell has rendered it “like a drowning man's catching at a straw.” We have the same, though not as a compound, in *Naishkarmyasiddhi* i. 76,—“एवं निराकृतोऽपि काशं कुशं वावलम्ब्याह.”

कूपमण्डूकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a frog in a well*. It is applied to an inexperienced person brought up in the narrow circle of home, and ignorant of public life and mankind. The following passage

from *Prasannarâghava-Nâṭaka* i. (page 13 of Nirṇayasâgara Press edition of 1893) illustrates the use of the term:—“कथं मामपि दशदिग्विलासिनीकर्णपूरीकृतकीर्तिपल्लवं त्रिभुवनवीरनामधेयं कूपमण्डूक इव सागरमविख्यातमपदिशसि” ॥

कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pots attached to the water-wheel of a well*. As the wheel revolves, some of the pots are going up and others are going down; some are full whilst others are empty; and so it is applied to illustrate the changes and chances of this mortal life. This is well put in *Mṛicchhakatika* x. 60:—

“कांश्चित्तुच्छयति प्रपूरयति वा कांश्चिन्नयत्युन्नतिं
कांश्चित्पातविधौ करोति च पुनः कांश्चिन्नयत्याकुलान् ।
अन्योन्यं प्रतिपक्षसंहतिमिमां लोकस्थितिं बोधय-
न्नेष कीडति कूपयन्त्रघटिकान्यायप्रसक्तो विधिः” ॥

Tārānâtha's explanation of this maxim is extremely tame, not to say nonsensical! According to him, it is intended to teach that as a pot is raised by the water-wheel from a deep well, so, by means of instruction, the essence of the S'âstras is drawn up, deep though they are by reason of their complexity!

कूर्माङ्गन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the limbs of the tortoise*. Its meaning and application will be apparent from the following passage taken from the Sâṅkhya section of *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (page 150 Bib. Ind. and 170 of Jivânanda's edition):—“यथा हि कूर्म-स्याङ्गानि कूर्मशरीरे निविशमानानि तिरोभवन्ति निःसरन्ति चाविर्भवन्त्येवं कारणस्य तन्वादेः पदादयो विशेषा निःसरन्त आविर्भवन्त उत्पद्यन्त इत्युच्यन्ते निविशमानास्तिरोभवन्तो विनश्यन्तीत्युच्यन्ते । न पुनरसतामुत्पत्तिः सतां वा विनाशः” ॥ Prof. Cowell renders it thus:—“As the limbs of a tortoise, when they retire within its shell, are concealed, and, when they come forth, are revealed, so the particular effects, as

cloth &c., of a cause, as threads &c., when they come forth and are revealed, are said to be produced; and when they retire and are concealed, they are said to be destroyed; but there is no such thing as the production of the non-existent, or the destruction of the existent." Very similar language is used by Vâchaspati Miśra, too, in his *Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī* 9 (pages 50, 51 of Târânâtha's edition), and 15. See also, *Kshurikâ-Upa-nishad* 3, and *Gîtâ* ii. 58.

क्षीरं विहायारोचकग्रस्तस्य सौवीररुचिमनुभवति ॥

"Leaving the milk suitable to the dyspeptic, he enjoys the sour gruel." This occurs in the Akshapâda section of *Sarvadaśanāsanagraha* (p. 118 of *Bib. Ind.* edition and p. 134 of Jivānanda's ed.) as follows:—"ननु सुखाभिव्यक्तिर्मुक्तिरिति पक्षं परित्यज्य दुःखनिवृत्तिरेव मुक्तिरिति स्वीकारः क्षीरं विहायारोचकस्य सौवीररुचिमनुभवतीति चेत्तदेतन्नाटकपक्षपतितं त्वद्वच इत्युपेक्ष्यते" ॥

Prof. Cowell translates it thus:—"But if you give up the view that liberation is the manifestation of happiness, and then accept such a view as that which holds it to be only the cessation of pain, does not your conduct resemble that of the dyspeptic patient who refused sweet milk and preferred sour rice-gruel? Your satire, however, falls powerless, as fitter for some speech in a play [rather than for a grave philosophical argument]."

खल्वाटबिल्वीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the bald (or bare-headed) man, and the woodapple. Vardhamāna (iii. 195) explains it thus:—"यथ खल्वाटः पर्यटन्नतर्कितं श्रीफलतरोरधस्तादागतो दैववशाच्च बिल्वमुपरि पतितं तद्वदन्योऽप्युभयवस्तुसंयोग एवमुच्यते" ॥ Bhartṛhari, in his *Nīṭis'ataka* 90, brings the bald man under a palm tree:—

“खल्वाटो दिवसेश्वरस्य किरणैः संतापितो मस्तके
वाञ्छन्देशमनातपं विधिवशात्तालस्य मूलं गतः ।

तत्राप्यस्य महाफलेन पतता भग्नं सशब्दं शिरः
प्रायो गच्छति यत्र भाग्यरहितस्तत्रैव यान्त्यापदः” ॥

This maxim belongs to the same class as अजाकृपाणीय and काक-
तालीय, which see.

गगनरोमन्थन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *ruminating on ether*. Equivalent to beating the air. It is found twice in the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*. First, in the Rāmānuja section (page 57 of Jivānanda's edition, and 47 of Bib. Ind.):—“तदेतद्गगनरोमन्थायितम्”, which Prof. Gough renders “All this is about as profitable as it would be for a ruminant animal to ruminate on ether.” Secondly, in the Pāṇini section (pages 162 and 143 respectively):—“तदेतद्गगनरोमन्थकल्पम्”, rendered by Prof. Cowell by “All this is only the ruminating of empty ether.”

गङ्गुरिकाप्रवाहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a continuous rush of sheep*. It is used to indicate the blind following of others like a flock of sheep. So the *Vāchaspatyam*, which says:—“गङ्गुरिकानामवीनां संघादेका चेन्नद्यादौ पतति तदा तत्संघान्तर्गताः सर्वेऽपि वार्यमाणा अपि तत्र पतन्तीति लोकप्रसिद्धा यत्र वार्यमाणानामपि अनिष्टमार्गे धावनं तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः” ॥ The expression occurs in Chap. viii. (page 214) of the *Kāvya-prakāśa* (Calc. 1866) where a very helpful note of Mahes'achandra's will be found; and also in Chap. vi, page 188, of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (Bib. Ind. 1851), which however, Mr. Pramādā-dāsa Mitra has rendered, “in pursuance of established custom.”

It is found, also, on pages 86 and 125 of the Bombay edition of Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*. There seems to be much difference of opinion as to the correct form of the first word of the maxim, since it appears in the four varieties of गङ्गुरिका, गङ्गुलिका, गङ्गारिका and गङ्गालिका.

गुडजिह्विकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the tongue and treacle*. The *Vāchaspatyam* thus explains its use:—“यथा तिक्तताम्रिया निम्बपानमकुर्वाणस्य बालस्य जिह्वायां गुडलेपं दत्त्वा पित्रादिस्तं निम्बं पाययति एवमर्थवादवाक्यानि बह्व्यास-साध्ये कर्मण्यप्रवर्त्तमानं पुरुषं स्वर्गाक्षय्यादिकं श्रावयित्वा प्रवर्त्तयन्ति । फलश्रुतिरपि रोचनार्था” ॥ The maxim is used by Abhinavagupta in his comment on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 30; but a better example is found in *Kāvya-pradīpa*, page 7 (B'bay edn.). See, too, *Padamānjari* (Pandit x. 254).

गोबलीवर्दन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the cattle and the bull*. In the *Pandit* for October 1867, Rājārāma S'āstrī expounded it thus:—“यत्र गाः कालय बलीवर्दं चेत्युच्यते तत्र गोपदेनैव बलीवर्दपदसिद्धौ बलीवर्दपदं दुर्द-स्यत्वज्ञापनपरत्वेन सफलमिति कल्प्यते” ॥ That given in the *Vāchaspatyam* is somewhat fuller:—“बलीवर्दस्य गोविशेषत्वेऽपि बलीवर्दस्य झटिति गोत्वेन बोधनार्थं यथा प्रयोगस्तथान्ययोः सामान्यविशेषरूपयोर्झटिति बोधनार्थं यत्र प्रयोगस्तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः” ॥ In his exposition of *Manu* viii. 28, where six classes of women are enumerated as having a claim to the king's protection, Kullūka says:—“अत्र चानेकशब्दोपादाने गोबलीवर्दन्यायेन पुनरुक्तिपरीहारः” ॥ The commentators Rāghavānanda and Govindarāja also quote the maxim in the same connection, and we have it in *Bhāmatī* 2. 3. 17, and in *Kāvya-pradīpa* page 300. It belongs to the same class as ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय and ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्याय.

गोमयपायसीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *cowdung and milk*. Some stupid person is supposed to argue that cowdung is identical with milk, because it comes from the cow; hence it is used to denote an utterly absurd argument or statement. It occurs in Vyāsa's bhāshya on *Yogasūtra* i. 32. He says:—“कथंचित्समाधीयमानमप्येतद्गोमय-

पायसीयन्यायमाक्षिपति” ॥ On which the *Yogavārtika* remarks:—
“गोमयं पायसं गव्यत्वादित्यादिन्यायमतदूषणं समाधीयमानमप्याक्षिपति
तिरस्करोति” ॥

It is found also in the Bauddha section of the *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha* (page 18 of Bib. Ind. and 22 of Jīvaṇanda's edition) in the following sentence:—“एवं चायमभेदसाधको हेतुर्गोमय-
पायसीयन्यायवदाभासतां भजेत्”, which Professor Gough renders
“Thus this argument which you adduce to prove that there is
difference between subject and object, turns out a mere absurd-
ity, like milky food made of cowdung.”

The compound गोमयपायसीय is included in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhī* iii. 196, but Vardhamāna has not explained it.

घट्टकुटीप्रभातन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *day-break in the vicinity of the toll-collector's hut*. A man, anxious to avoid paying toll, takes another road, but losing his way in the dark, finds himself, at day-break, in the vicinity of that very toll-gate! The saying is employed to illustrate उद्देश्यासिद्धि, as Prof. Cowell puts it; that is, failure to accomplish a desired object. It occurs in the Pāṇini section of *Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha* as follows:—“ननु स्फोटवाचकतापक्षेऽपि प्रागुक्तविकल्पप्रसरेण घट्टकुटीप्रभातायितमिति चेत्तदेत-
न्मनोराज्यविजृम्भणं वैषम्यसंभवात्”, which is thus rendered by Prof. Cowell:—“But even on your own hypothesis that there is a certain thing called *sphoṭa* which expresses the meaning, the same untenable alternative will recur which we discussed before; and therefore it will only be a case of the proverb that ‘the dawn finds the smuggler with the revenue-officer's house close by’. This, however, is only the inflation of the world of fancy from the wide difference between the two cases.”

S'rīharsha, too, used the proverb in his *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍa-khāḍya* (page 35):—“तर्हि कारणस्य सत्तामभ्युपगतवानसीति घट्टकुटी-
प्रभातमिति चेन्न” ॥ See also *Siddhāntaśaṅkha*, p. 116.

घुणाक्षरन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the letter made by the wood-worm *ghuṇa*. This worm bores holes in wood and in books which sometimes assume the shape of a letter of the alphabet; hence its use to intimate the occurrence of something quite accidental. Here is Vardhamāna's (iii. 195) description of it:—"घुणोत्किरणात्कथंचिन्निष्पन्नमक्षरं घुणाक्षरम् । तदिव यदकुशलेन दैवान्निष्पद्यते तद्वुणाक्षरीयम्" ॥

The proverb is found in the opening part of *Prasannarāghava* (page 9 of Nirṇaya-sāgara Press edition) as follows:—"अहो घुणाक्षरन्यायो यदिदं भ्रमरद्वयं प्रति मयोक्तं बन्दिद्वयं प्रति फलितं वचः" ॥ Also in *Rājatarāṅginī* iv. 167:—"त्रीनवारान्समरे जित्वा जितं मेने स मुमुनिम् । सकृज्जयमरेर्वीरा मन्यन्ते हि घुणाक्षरम्" ॥ *Māgha* iii. 58 may also be referred to.

चौरापराधान्माण्डव्यनिग्रहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the punishment of *Māṇḍavya* for the crime committed by robbers. The story of the Rishi Aṇi-Māṇḍavya is told at length in *Ādiparva* cvii, cviii. Whilst he was practising severe austerities, in conjunction with the *mauna-vrata*, some robbers concealed themselves and their plunder in his *Ās'rama*. The king's guard found them there, and, believing the sage to be implicated in the affair, carried him off together with them and impaled them all together! Māṇḍavya was eventually removed from the stake, but its point (अणी) remained in him; hence the name, given him by the people, of Aṇi-Māṇḍavya. The maxim is found in the *Pūrṇaprajna* chapter of *Sarvādars'anasangraha* (page 73 of Jivānanda's edition, and 62 of Bib. Indica.):—"तस्मान्न भेदप्रत्यक्षं सुप्रसरमिति चेत्किं वस्तुस्वरूपभेदवादिनं प्रति इमानि दूषणान्युद्धव्यन्ते किं धर्मिभेदवादिनं प्रति । प्रथमे चौरापराधान्माण्डव्यनिग्रहन्यायापातः" ॥

छत्त्रिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the men with umbrellas*. The thought here is of a crowd of men, *many* of them with umbrellas up, and so *all* seeming to have them. Its application will be apparent from the examples which follow. We have one in S'ankara's bhâshya on *Kaṭha-Upanishad* iii. 1 (“ऋतं पिबन्तौ” &c.):—“एकस्तत्र कर्मफलं पिबति मुहुः नेतरस्तथापि पातुसंबन्धात्पिबन्तावित्युच्यते छत्त्रिन्यायेन” ॥ Again, in his bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 3. 3. 34, where the same text is expounded:—“ऋतं पिबन्तावित्यत्र तु जीवे पिबत्यशनायाद्यतीतः परमात्मापि साहचर्याच्छत्त्रिन्यायेन पिबतीत्युपचर्यते” ॥ On the former of these two passages, the commentator Gopâla Yatindra says:—“छत्त्रिन्यायेनेति । यथा लोके छत्त्रिणो गच्छन्तीति प्रयोगे सपरिवारे राज्ञि गच्छति छत्र्यछत्त्रिसमुदाये छत्त्रिशब्दो वर्त्तत एकसमूहवाहित्वेनैवं पिबदपिबत्समुदाये पिबतिर्वर्त्तत इत्यर्थः ॥

I have met with the maxim in the *Kuvalayananda* also under the figure उल्लास, and in Ânandagiri on *Brahmasûtra-bhâshya* 1. 2. 11; 1. 4. 12.

तमोदीपन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *darkness and the lamp*. This is found in the *Vedântasiddhântamuktâvali*, edited with Notes and Translation by Prof. Venis. On page 125 we read:—“तदयं तमोदीपन्यायः । तथाहि । अज्ञानं ज्ञातुमिच्छेद्यो मानेनात्यन्तमूढधीः । स तु नूनं तमः पश्येदीपेनोत्तमतेजसा” ॥ “Hence the well-known illustration of darkness and the lamp:—Thus ‘that dullest of dull-heads who would cognize Nescience by means of a pramâṇa, would forsooth go looking for darkness with a brilliant lamp.’”

दग्धपटन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the burnt cloth*. When a piece of cloth, or a leaf, is thrown into the fire and consumed, its outline is still visible in the charred remains; and this the Vedântists use to illustrate the unreality and unsubstantiality of all phenomena.

It occurs twice in Nṛsiṃhasarasvatī's commentary on the *Vedāntasāra*, namely on pages 55 and 66 of my edition, as follows:—“यद्वा सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्मेतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वमित्यादिश्रुतिबलात्सर्वमहमिति गिरिनदीसमुद्रात्मकं सर्वं जगत्स्वाभिन्नसच्चिदानन्दब्रह्मत्वेनानुभूय तस्य दग्धपटन्यायेन प्रपञ्चभानेऽप्यद्वैतं सच्चिदानन्दलक्षणं वस्तु भासत एवेत्यर्थः” ॥ (Page 55).

“नन्वेतादृशस्य जीवन्मुक्तस्य देहेन्द्रियादिभानमस्ति न वेत्याशङ्क्य दग्धपटन्यायेनेन्द्रजालनिर्मितसौधसमुद्रादिवच्च बाधितानुवृत्त्या मिथ्यात्वेन भानेऽपि परमार्थतया भानं नेत्याह अयमित्यादिना न पश्यतीत्यन्तेन” ॥ (Page 66).

दण्डापूपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the stick and the cakes*. If a number of cakes (chapâṭis) are attached to a stick, and the stick is carried off, or eaten by mice, the inference is that the cakes have shared the same fate. The application of the maxim is obvious. In the *Sāhityakaumudī* (xi. 8), and in the *Kuvalayānanda* (page 244 of Jivānanda's edition), it is used to illustrate the figure अर्थापत्ति and काव्यार्थापत्ति respectively.

“दण्डापूपिकयान्यार्थागमोऽर्थापत्तिरिष्यते ॥ ८ ॥ मूषिकेण दण्डो भक्षितश्चेदिहस्थः पूपोऽपि तेन भक्षित इति न्यायो दण्डापूपिका । तयान्यार्थागमोऽर्थान्तरप्रत्ययोऽर्थापत्तिरित्यर्थः” ॥ (*Sāh.*).

“कैमुत्येनार्थसंसिद्धिः काव्यार्थापत्तिरिष्यते* । स जितस्त्वन्मुखेनेन्दुः का वाक्ता सरसीरुहाम् ॥ अत्र स इत्यनेन पद्मानि येन जितानीति विवक्षितं तथा च सोऽपि येन जितस्तेन पद्मानि जितानीति किमु वक्तव्यमिति दण्डापूपिकान्यायेन पद्मजयरूपस्यार्थस्य संसिद्धिः काव्यार्थापत्तिः । ताद्विकाभिमतार्थापत्तिव्यावर्त्तनाय काव्येति विशेषणम्” ॥ (*Kuv.*).

देहलीदीपन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *a lamp on the threshold*. A lamp so placed

* The author of *Rasagangādhara* finds fault with this definition. See page 487 of Durgaprasāda's edition, Bombay 1888.

gives light both inside and outside the house; and the maxim is applied to something which fulfils a two-fold purpose. It is thus akin to अन्तर्दीपिकान्याय, काकाक्षिगोलकन्याय and others of a like nature. We have an instance of the employment of this maxim in the eleventh chapter of Ānandagiri's *S'ankaravijaya* (page 82 of Bib. Ind. edition), as follows:—"स चतुर्मुखस्तत्सङ्घा तदेवानुप्राविशत्तदनुप्रविश्य सच्च त्यच्चाभवदिति श्रुतेरयमर्थः । तत्कार्यरूपं जगत्सङ्घा उत्पाद्य तदेव स्वसृष्टमेव अयमेव एवकारो देहलीदीपन्यायेन तथानुप्राविशदित्यनेन संबध्यते" ॥ For this reference, I am indebted to my friend Prof. E. B. Cowell. S'abara in his bhāṣhya on *Jaimini* 12. 1. 3 practically makes use of this nyāya though he does not actually mention the word देहली. He says:—"पशावपि क्रियमाणान्यङ्गानि पुरोडाशस्य सन्निहितानि, सन्निधानाच्च पुरोडाशस्याप्युपकुर्वन्तीति प्रदीपवत् । यथा प्रासादे कृतः प्रदीपः सन्निधानाद्वाजमार्गेऽप्युपकरोति" ॥ In the December number of the *Pandit* for 1867, Bālas'āstrī explained देहलीदीपन्याय, and illustrated it by the following verse from the *Rāmāyaṇa*:—"अस्त्रेणापि हि बद्धस्य भयं मम न जायते । पितामहमहेन्द्राभ्यां रक्षितस्यानिलेन च" ॥ Here the word रक्षितस्य is connected with the words immediately preceding as well as with that which follows it.

नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the lost horses and burnt chariot. This is based on the story of two men travelling in their respective chariots, and one of them losing his horses and the other having his chariot burnt, through the outbreak of a fire in the village in which they were putting up for the night. The horses that were left were harnessed to the remaining chariot, and the two men pursued their journey together. Its teaching is—union for mutual advantage. That the story is very old is clear from the fact that the saying is quoted in the 16th *vārtika* ("संप्रयोगो वा नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवत्") to *Pāṇini* 1. 1. 50, and is explained by Patañjali. It appears also in Sures'vara's *Bṛihadāraṇya-*

bhāṣhyavārtika 2. 1. 38, which reads thus:—“नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवह्न्याय चाश्रित्य भूमिपम् । प्राह मानुषवित्ताद्यं दैववित्तसमन्वितः” ॥ On which Ānandagiri says:—“अधिकारिणे विद्यां वक्तुं गार्ग्यश्चेदुपचक्रमे तर्हि योग्यं ब्राह्मणं हित्वा किमिति राजानमुपेत्य ब्रवीति । तत्राह नष्टेति । यथाहुर्युक्तः संयोगोऽधिकारार्थेन हेतुना नष्टाश्वदग्धरथवदिति” ॥

Rāmatīrtha, too, quotes the maxim in his comment on the *Vedāntasāra* (page 93, line 3, of my edition):—“नष्टाश्वदग्धरथन्यायेन ‘कर्मणा पितृलोक’ इति श्रुतिरूपपद्यते”, of which the following translation is found in *The Paṇḍit* for May 1872:—“The Vedic text ‘The world of progenitors is attained by works, can be explained according to the analogy of two men, of whom the horses of the one are lost and the chariot of the other burnt [for the horses of the latter may be yoked to the car of the former, and they may travel together; and in like manner, constant and occasional works, though no special result has been recorded of them, may supply a cause for the attainment of the world of the progenitors, which requires some special works as a condition].” See also *Tantravārtika*, pp. 15, 709, 832.

नहि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति ॥

A young fawn cannot stand up against a full-grown lion. This is found in the Akṣhapāda chapter of *Sarvādars'ana-sangraha* (page 136 of Jivānanda's, and 119 of Bib. Ind.):—“नैतत्परीक्षाक्षममीक्ष्यते नहि कठोरकण्ठीरवस्य कुरङ्गशावः प्रतिभटो भवति”, which Prof. Cowell renders, “This pretended inference will no more stand examination than the young fawn can stand the attack of the full-grown lion.”

नहि वरविघाताय कन्योद्वहः ॥

The bride is not married for the destruction of the bridegroom. This is found in the Pūrnāprajña chapter of *Sarva-*

dars'anasangraha (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jivânanda's edn.). In the *Vâchaspatyam*, the maxim is given in the *positive* form, viz. “वरघाताय कन्यावरणम्” with the other as a possible variant. Târânâtha explains it thus:—“विषकन्यायां वृतायां यत्र वरस्य घातः संभाव्यते तत्र तां नोद्वहेदेवं विवक्षायामस्य प्रवृत्तिः । तथा चानिष्ठान्तरपातादिसंभावनायामभीष्टहेतुरपि वस्तु न वरणीयमित्येवं तद्व्यायतात्पर्यम् । अयमेव न्यायः क्वचिन्नहि वरघाताय कन्यामुद्राहयतीति न्यायतया पठ्यते” ॥ We have a reference to “poison-damsels” in *Kathâsaritsâgara* xix. 82, which reads thus:—“विदधे विषकन्याश्च सैन्ये पण्यविलसिनीः । ग्राहिणोत्पुरुषांश्चैव निशासु छद्मघातिनः” ॥ In a footnote to his translation of the passage, Mr. Tawney says, “One of these poison-damsels is represented as having been employed against Chandragupta in the *Mudrâ-Râkshasa*. Compare the xith tale in the *Gesta Romanorum*, where an Indian queen sends one to Alexander the Great. Aristotle frustrates the stratagem.”

पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the washing off of mud*. It is evidently deduced from *Pañchatantra* ii. 157, a verse intended to strengthen an argument against the possession of riches under any circumstances, and which reads thus:—“धर्मार्थं यस्य वित्तेहा तस्यापि न शुभावहा । प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम्” ॥ “If a man desires wealth for charitable purposes, even to him it will bring no good; for, better than the washing off of mud is the keeping away from it altogether.” The nyâya is therefore the equivalent of our “Prevention is better than cure.” It is used twice by Ânandagiri on *Brahmasûtrabhâshya* 4. 1. 16. as follows:—“अग्निहोत्रादीनामपि पुण्यान्तरवद्विनाशयत्वात्पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायापातादारुरुक्षुणापि तानि नानुष्ठेयानि”; “धीनाश्यानामपि कर्मणामनुष्ठानस्य विद्योत्पत्त्यर्थतया पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायानवकाशात्पूर्वं ज्ञानादनुष्ठेयान्यग्निहोत्रादीनीति सिद्धान्तप्रतिज्ञां विवृणोति.” See also *Bhâmatî* and *Bhâshyaratnaprabhâ* on the same.

पङ्गुन्धन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the lame man and the blind man*. The conception is that of a lame man mounted on the shoulders of one who is blind, so that the former is furnished with the power of locomotion and the latter with sight. It is intended to illustrate mutual dependence for mutual advantage, as exemplified in *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 21, the text of which, with Colebrooke's translation, is as follows:—"पुरुषस्य दर्शनार्थं कैवल्यार्थं तथा प्रधानस्य । पङ्गुन्धवदुभयोरपि संयोगस्तत्कृतः सर्गः" ॥ "For the soul's contemplation of Nature, and for its abstraction, the union of both takes place, as of the halt and blind. By that union a creation is framed." Vāchaspati Miśra ignores the illustration, but Pandit Tārānātha (in his edition of 1871) has a helpful note on it. He says:—"उक्तार्थे दृष्टान्तः पङ्गुन्धवदिति । यथा गतिशक्तिरहितस्य पङ्गोर्गतिसाधनाय गतिमतोऽन्धस्यापेक्षा, दृष्टिशक्तिरहितस्य चान्धस्य गतिशक्तिसत्त्वेऽपि स्वाभीष्टदेशगमनं दर्शकमन्तरेण न संभवति तथा च यथा स्वस्वकार्याय तयोरन्योन्यापेक्षा तथा क्रियारहितस्य पुरुषस्य सक्रियप्रधानस्यापेक्षा दृष्टिशक्तिरहितस्य च प्रधानस्य दृष्टिशक्तियुक्तपुरुषस्यापेक्षेत्यत उभाभ्यामन्योन्यमपेक्ष्य स्वस्वकार्यं निष्पाद्यत इत्यर्थः" ॥ The above *kārikā*, is quoted on the last page of the Sāṅkhya section of *Sarvādars'naśaṅgraha*, and is preceded by a very clear explanation of the maxim.

पञ्जरचालनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the moving of the bird-cage*. In a discussion on *prāṇa*, under *Vedāntasūtra* 2. 4. 9, S'ankara introduces this maxim and explains it thus:—"ननु पञ्जरचालनन्यायेनैतद्भविष्यति । यथैकपञ्जरवर्तिन एकादशपक्षिणः प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतव्यापाराः सन्तः संभूयैकं पञ्जरं चालयन्ति । एवमेकशरीरवर्तिन एकादशप्राणाः प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतवृत्तयः सन्तः संभूयैकां प्राणाख्यां वृत्तिं प्रतिलप्स्यन्त इति" ॥ Dr. Thibaut translates the passage as follows:—"But, an objection may be raised, the thing may take place in the manner of the moving [of the?] bird-cage. Just as eleven birds shut up in one cage, may, although each makes a separate effort, move the cage by the

combination of their efforts, so the eleven prâṇas which abide in one body may, although each has its own special function, by the combination of these functions, produce one common function called prâṇa."

पाटच्चरलुण्ठिते वेश्मनि यामिकजागरणम् ॥

The vigilance of the watchman after the house has been plundered by thieves. Equivalent to our proverb "Shutting the stable door after the horse is gone." It occurs in Khaṇḍa-nakhaṇḍakhâdyâ, page 45:—"प्रयोजनानुपयुक्ते काले तस्य स्वरूपतोऽवस्थानं पाटच्चरलुण्ठिते वेश्मनि यामिकजागरणवृत्तान्तमनुहरति" ॥

पिण्याकयाचनार्थं गतस्य खारिकातैलदातृत्वाभ्युपगमः ॥

He went to crave the leavings of the oil-seed, and had instead to agree to give 16 measures of oil. Used of one completely worsted in argument. I render पिण्याक in accordance with its meaning in Pañchatantra iii. 99 ("श्रेयस्त्रैलं च पिण्याकात्"). The maxim is found in the Pûrnâprajna section of the Sarva-dars'anasangraha (page 63 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jivâ-nanda):—"सोऽयं पिण्याकयाचनार्थं गतस्य खारिकातैलदातृत्वाभ्युपगम इव", which Prof. Gough renders:—"And thus it must be allowed that, in raising the objection, you have begged for a little oil-cake, and have had to give us gallons of oil."

पिष्टपेषणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the grinding of that which is already ground. Fruitless reiteration, unproductive repetition. We find it in S'ankara's bhâshya on Kena-Upanishad 32:—"यदि तावच्छ्रु-तस्यार्थस्य भ्रमः कृतस्ततः पिष्टपेषणवत्पुनरुक्तोऽनर्थकः भ्रमः स्यात्" ॥ Also in Sudars'anârya's comment on Âpastamba-Grihyasûtra xiv. 9 ("पुंसुवनं व्यक्ते गर्भे तिज्येण"), where he says "इदमपि सीमन्तवद्वथम एव न तु प्रतिगर्भं पिष्टपेषणन्यायात्" ॥

The maxim of the destruction of the chief antagonist. The principle that when the most formidable enemy has been defeated, the less formidable are already virtually overcome. In the bhâshya on *Vedântasûtra* 1. 4. 28 (“एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः”) we read:—“अतः प्रधानमल्लनिवर्हणन्यायेनातिदिशति । एतेन प्रधानकारणवादप्रतिषेधन्यायकलापेन सर्वेऽण्वादिकारणवादा अपि प्रतिषिद्धतया व्याख्याता वेदितव्याः” ॥ Here, there is undoubtedly a play on the word प्रधान, the Sâmkhya theory of the Pradhâna being the chief antagonist met and overcome in the foregoing Sûtras and bhâshya. The same expression appears again in the bhâshya on *Sûtra* 2. 1. 12, and the maxim is found, too, in the Râmânûja chapter of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 54 of Jivânanda's edition, and p. 45 of Bib. Ind. edition).

बीजाङ्कुरन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the seed and the shoot. As the seed produces the shoot, so the latter in turn reproduces the former. Each therefore is a cause and an effect. The maxim is met with very frequently in the literature. We find it in *Brahmasûtra-bhâshya* 2. 1. 36 (on the eternity of the world) as follows:—“न च कर्मान्तरेण शरीरं संभवति । न च शरीरमन्तरेण कर्म संभवतीतीतरेतराश्रयत्वप्रसङ्गः । अनादित्वे तु बीजाङ्कुरन्यायेनोपपत्तेर्न कश्चिद्दोषो भवति”, which is rendered thus by Dr. Thibaut:—“Without merit and demerit no body can enter into existence, and again, without a body merit and demerit cannot be formed; so that—on the doctrine of the world having a beginning—we are led into a logical see-saw. The opposite doctrine, on the other hand, explains all matters in a manner analogous to the case of the seed and sprout, so that no difficulty remains.” It occurs again at the end of the bhâshya on 3. 2. 9. Also in the Ârhatta section of *Sarvadars'anasangraha* (page 31 of Bib. Ind., and 37 of Jivânanda), and in Râmâtirtha's commentary on *Vedântasâra* (page 110 of my edition).



ब्राह्मणपरिव्राजकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the *Brāhmans and the mendicants*. In such a sentence as ब्राह्मणा भोजयितव्याः परिव्राजकाश्च the separate mention of the latter, who are really included in the former term, merely emphasizes their position as a special part of the general body. It is thus the exact parallel, of the गोबलीवर्दन्याय and of the ब्राह्मणवसिष्ठन्याय. It is used by S'ankara three times in his exposition of the *Vedāntasūtras*, namely under 1. 4. 16, 2. 3. 15, and 3. 1. 11; but I forbear to quote his words, for without a lengthy portion of context they would be unintelligible. It appears also in *Tantravārtika*, pages 423, 590.

ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the *Brāhman-ascetic*. The श्रमण is a Buddhist ascetic, and therefore not a Brāhman,—but the expression ब्राह्मणश्रमण implies that though now a Buddhist he was formerly a Brāhman. The maxim is used by the authors of the *Kāvya-prakāśa* (page 68 of Calc. edn. of 1866) and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* (article 257) in exactly the same connexion. After giving an example of 'suggested meaning' in the form of 'semblance of contradiction' (विरोधाभास), the author of the latter work says:—“अत्रामित इत्यादावपिशब्दाभावाद्विरोधाभासो व्यङ्ग्यः। व्यङ्ग्यस्यालंकार्यत्वेऽपि ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्यायादलंकारत्वमुपचर्यते”, which Mr. Pramādādāsa Mitra renders thus:—“Here, from the absence of the particle अपि after the words अमित &c., the semblance of the ornament named 'contradiction' is suggested. The suggested meaning, though strictly what is ornamented, is figuratively spoken of here as the ornament, with reference to its being an ornament in another condition [*i. e.* when it is *expressed*, not suggested], just as we use the word Brāhman-mendicant, which, though it etymologically means an absurdity, viz a mendicant, or one not a Brāhman, who is a Brāhman, tropically signifies one who *was* a Brāhman.”

भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न शान्तो व्याधिः ॥

Although the garlic has been eaten the disease is not cured. This proverb is applied as follows by Nṛsimhasarasvatī in his comment on the opening verse of the *Vedāntasāra*:—“ ननु भक्षितेऽपि लशुने न शान्तो व्याधिरिति न्यायेन प्रपञ्चस्याधिष्ठानव्यतिरिक्ततयाप्रती-
यमानत्वात्कथमद्वैतसिद्धिरित्याशङ्कं तृणीकुर्वन्नाह अखण्डमिति ” ॥

भिक्षुपादप्रसारणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of a *beggar's obtaining a footing* [in a patron's house]. Tārānātha explains it thus:—“ यथा कश्चिन्निक्षुर्येष्टभो-
जनाच्छादनवासगृहादिलाभार्थं कस्यचिद्धनिनो गृहे प्रविश्य युगपत्सर्वाभीष्टालाभं
मन्यमानः प्रथमं धनिगृहे मे पादप्रसारणमस्तु पश्चादनेन परिचयमुत्पाद्य सर्व-
मभीष्टं संपादयिष्यामीति धिया स्वल्पमपि भिक्षां बहुमन्यमानः पश्चात्क्रमेण
स्वाभीष्टं संपादयत्येवं यत्र विवक्षा तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः ” ॥

It occurs in the Bauddha chapter of *Sarvādars'anasangraha* (page 14 of Bib. Ind. edn.) as follows:—“ माध्यमिकास्तावदुत्तमप्रज्ञा
इत्थमचीकथन्मिभुपादप्रसारणन्यायेन क्षणभङ्गाद्यभिधानमुखेन स्थायित्वानुकूल-
वेदनीयत्वानुगतसर्वसत्यत्वभ्रमव्यावर्तनेन सर्वशून्यतायामेव पर्यवसानम् ॥
Here is Prof. Gough's rendering:—“ The Mādhyamikas, excel-
lently wise, explain as follows, namely that the doctrine of
Buddha terminates in that of a total void (universal baseless-
ness or nihilism) by a slow progression *like the intrusive steps
of a mendicant*, through the position of a momentary flux,
and through the (gradual) negation of the illusory assurances
of pleasurable sensibility, of universality, and of reality.”

मण्डूकमुत्तिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of a *frog's leap*. Used by grammarians and others to express the passing from one rule to another over intervening ones. The St. Petersburg Lexicon gives references to its use in the commentary on *Pāṇini* 1. 4. 47 (in the old Calcutta edition of 1810), and in the *Siddhānta-kaumudī* on

Pāṇini 5. 1. 117 (तदहम्). I have met with it also in Jayaratha's commentary on *Alankārasarvasva* 20 (“विषयस्यापह्नवेऽपह्नुतिः”), where he says:—“केचन मण्डूकश्रुतिन्यायेनानुवर्तनस्यानुचितत्वाद्भ्रान्तिमदनन्तरमपह्नुतिर्ग्रन्थकृता लक्षिता उल्लेखश्चातिशयोक्त्यनन्तरमिति ग्रन्थं विपर्यासितवन्तः । न चैतत्” ॥

मध्यदीपिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of the *central lamp*. The idea is of a lamp in a central position shedding its light on both sides. It occurs in the *Mundaka-bhāṣya* 1. 1. 3 (शौनको ह वै महाशालोऽङ्गिरसं विधिवदुपसन्नः पप्रच्छ):—“शौनकाङ्गिरसोः संबन्धादर्वाग्विधिवद्विशेषणादुपसदनविधेः पूर्वेषामनियम इति गम्यते । मर्यादाकरणार्थं मध्यदीपिकान्यायार्थं वा विशेषणम्” ॥ Also in Rāmātīrtha on *Vedāntasāra* (page 129 of my edition):—“मध्यप्रदीपन्यायेनोत्तरत्रापि जाग्रद्वासनेत्यत्र कोशत्रयपदं संबध्यते”, which is thus rendered by Prof. Gough (in the *Pandit* for Feb. 1873, p. 212):—“The term triad of sheaths has a double connection [with both the preceding and following clauses], after the manner of a lamp placed in the middle of a door [and throwing light both inwards and outwards].” Akin to this is *मध्यमणिन्याय*, which is explained in the *Pandit* for Dec. 1867 as referring to the central ruby of a nose-ring which casts a lustre on the pearl on each side of it.

मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिः ॥

To know the thing to be measured you must know the measure. This is quoted in the opening part of the Akṣhapāda section of *Sarvadarś'anasangraha*:—“मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिरिति न्यायेन प्रमाणस्य प्रथममुद्देशे तदनुसारेण लक्षणस्य कथनीयतया प्रथमोद्दिष्टस्य प्रमाणस्य प्रथमं लक्षणं कथ्यते” ॥ Prof. Cowell's translation is as follows:—“In accordance with the principle that ‘to know the thing to be measured you must first know the measure’ proof (pramāṇa) is first enunciated, and as this must be done by defining it, we

have first a definition of proof." I do not know whether Cit sukha Muni is older than Mādhava (middle of 14th century) but if he is, he may be the author of the maxim; for we find it in his work *Tattvapradīpikā* (or *Citsukhī*) ii. 18, as follows: "मानाधीना मेयसिद्धिर्मानसिद्धिश्च लक्षणात् । तच्चाध्यक्षादिमानेषु गीर्वाणैरपि दुर्भेगम्" ॥ Compare also the following from *Saṅkshepas'ārīraka* (i. 487):—"मानेन मेयावगतिश्च युक्ता धर्मस्य जाड्याद्विधिनिष्काण्डे । मेयेन मानावगतिस्तु युक्ता वेदान्तवाक्येष्वजडं हि मेयम्" ॥ See, too, *Saṅkhyakārikā* 4 ("प्रमेयसिद्धिः प्रमाणाद्धिः").

मुञ्जादिषीकोद्धरणन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the extraction of the interior spike of the *Munja* grass. The following verse from the *Pañcadās'ī* (i. 42), with an extract from Rāmakṛishna's comment thereon will fully explain the meaning and application of the saying:—"यथा मुञ्जादिषीकैवमात्मा युक्त्या समुद्धतः । शरीरत्रितयाद्दीरैः परं ब्रह्मैव जायते" ॥ "यथा येन प्रकारेण मुञ्जादेतन्नामकात्तृणविशेषादिषीका गर्भस्थं कोमलं तृणं युक्त्या बहिरावरकत्वेन स्थितानां स्थूलपत्राणां विभजनलक्षणेनोपायेन समुद्ध्रियत एवमात्मापि...शरीरत्रितयात्...धीरैः...समुद्धतः पृथक् कृतश्चेत्स परं ब्रह्मैव जायते" ॥ This is unquestionably the meaning, and not as my learned friend Prof. A. Venis rendered it (in *Pandit*, vol. V. page 613), "Just as Ishikā grass may be distinguished from the Munja species &c." I never heard the maxim explained by Pandits in Western India in any other way than that given above. It is found also in Rāmatīrtha's commentary on the *Vedāntasāra*, page 140 of my edition.

लोष्टप्रस्तारन्यायः ॥

This occurs in Abhinavagupta's comment on *Dhvanyāloka* iii. 16 (page 159 of Pandit Durgāprasād's edn.) in the following sentence:—"तेन लोष्टप्रस्तारन्यायेनानन्तवैचित्र्यमुक्तम्," and could only mean the maxim of an expanse of clods of earth [as in a

roughly ploughed field]. Regarding however प्रस्तर as a mis-
 lection for प्रस्तर it would mean the maxim of *a stone and a*
clod of earth, and would be synonymous with अश्मलोष्टन्याय of
 the dictionaries, but which I have not met with in the litera-
 ture. Âpte, following the *Vâcaspatyam*, explains the latter
 thus:—"A clod may be considered to be hard when compared
 with cotton, but is soft as compared with a stone. So a person
 may be considered to be very important as compared with his
 inferiors, but sinks into insignificance when compared with his
 betters." Târânâtha adds that when it is intended to indicate
 that there is *very little* difference between two things or
 persons compared, the kindred maxim पाषाणेष्टकान्याय is used.
 With these Âpte compares the Marâthî proverb "दगडापेक्षां वीट
 मऊ" "Brick is softer than stone." The sense, however, is not
 quite the same; for, according to Molesworth, the Marâthî say-
 ing is used "in ironical softening of a difficulty or hardship but
barely surmountable or sufferable, by comparing it with a
 matter *utterly* impracticable or intolerable."

वरं सांशयिकान्निष्कादसांशयिकः कार्षापणः ॥

Better is a certain kârshâpâna than an uncertain nishka.
 This and the proverb immediately following are found in the
 second chapter of Vâtsyâyana's *Kâmasûtra* (page 19 of
 Pandit Durgâprasâd's edition of 1891), and are the equivalents
 of our saying "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush."

वरमद्य कपोतः श्वो मयूरात् ॥

Better is a pigeon to-day than a peacock tomorrow. See
 above.

विपुलकदलीफललिप्सया जिह्वाच्छेदनम् ॥

Cutting off the tongue while trying to get a fine plantain.

This is found in the Pûrṇaprajna section of *Sarvadars'ana-sangraha* (page 64 of Bib. Ind., and 75 of Jivānanda's edn.) as follows:—"एवं च परमेश्वराभेदतृष्णया विष्णोरुणोत्कर्षस्य मृगतृष्णिकासम-त्वाभिधानं विपुलकदलीफललिप्सया जिह्वाच्छेदनमनुहरत्येतादृशविष्णुविद्वेषणाद-न्धतमसप्रवेशप्रसङ्गात्" ॥ Prof. Gough renders it thus:—"Thus the statement of those (Advaita-vādins) in their thirst to be one with the Supreme Lord, that the supreme excellence of Vishṇu is like a mirage, is as if they were to cut off their tongues in trying to get a fine plantain, since it results that through offending this supreme Vishṇu they must enter into the hell of blind darkness."

विषकृमिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *worms bred in poison* (or, *in manure*) Âpte's Dictionary alone gives us this nyāya which he describes as follows:—"It is used to denote a state of things which, though fatal to others, is not so to those who being bred in it, are inured or naturalized to it." In this case it might represent our "What is one man's food is another man's poison." Âpte gives no reference to a passage where the maxim is used, and I am indebted for one to that veritable *ratnākara*, Dr. Böhlingk's *Indische Sprüche* (6164). It consists of a quotation from *Vṛiddha-Cānakhya*, a work which appears to exist in MS. only. It runs thus:—

विप्रास्मिन्नगरे महान्कथय कस्तालद्रुमाणां गणः

को दाता रजको ददाति वसनं प्रातर्गृहीत्वा निशि ।

को दक्षः परदारवित्तहरणे सर्वोऽपि दक्षो जनः

कस्माज्जीवसि हे सखे विषकृमिन्यायेन जीवाभ्यहम् ॥

The Doctor renders the last line by "Wozu lebst du, o Freund? Ich lebe nach Art des Mistkäfers (d. i. ich suche das Beste heraus)." If this is correct, the nyāya must be expressive of "living in clover," or, amidst "marrow and fatness!"

विषवृक्षन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the poisonous tree*. This appears to be based on the second half of *Kumārasambhava* ii. 55 (or *Pañca-tantra* i. 245), which runs thus:—“विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्धय स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रतम्.” “It would be improper to cut down even a poisonous tree, after cultivating it oneself.” This is used as a maxim by the author of *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhāḍya* (page 727) in the following sentence:—“एते सर्वे तर्काः...अस्माभिरेव तर्कपदव्याम-भिषिक्तास्ततो न प्रबन्धेन निरस्यन्ते ‘विषवृक्षोऽपि संवर्धय स्वयं छेत्तुमसाम्प्रत-मिति’ ” ॥ The application of this nyāya is best seen from the first line of Kālidāsa’s verse quoted above.

वीचीतरङ्गन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *wave-undulation*. This is used by the author of the *Bhāṣhāpariccheda* (verses 165, 166) to account for the production of sound. He says:—“सर्वः शब्दो न भववृत्तिः श्रोत्रो-त्पन्नस्तु गृह्यते । वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन तदुत्पत्तिस्तु कीर्तिता । कदम्बकोरकन्यायादुत्पत्तिः कस्यचिन्मते ” ॥ Almost the same words are used by Vedāntin Mahādeva (latter part of 17th century) in his comment on *Sāṅkhyasūtra* V. 103:—किंतु शब्द एव वीचीतरङ्गन्यायेन कदम्बमुकुलन्यायेन वा श्रोत्रदेशं गतः श्रोत्रेण गृह्यते ”. “But sound comes to the seat of hearing in the same manner as the undulating waves [of water], or as the anthers of a [globulous] Kadamba-flower and is thus apprehended by the ear.” The latter passage, with translation, I have taken from Dr. R. Garbe’s fine edition.

वृद्धकुमारीवाक्यन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the request of the aged spinster*. This is recorded in *Mahābhāṣhya* 8. 2. 3 as follows:—“अथवा वृद्धकुमारी-वाक्यवदिदं द्रष्टव्यम् । तद्यथा । वृद्धकुमारीन्द्रेणोक्ता वरं वृणीष्वेति सा वरमवृणीत पुत्रा मे बहुक्षीरघृतमोदनं कांस्यपात्रायां भुञ्जीरन्निति । न च तावदस्याः पतिर्भवति

कुतः पुत्राः कुतो गावः कुतो धान्यम् । तत्रानयैकेन वाक्येन पतिः पुत्रा गावो धान्यमिति सर्वं संगृहीतं भवति ” ॥ This would be applied to a sentence having a variety of meanings. In *Tantravārtika* 2. 2. 2 (page 452) we meet with it as वृद्धकुमारीवरप्रार्थन; and in the *Pandit* for December 1867 (page 156) we find exactly the same kind of thing under the heading वृद्धब्राह्मणवरन्यायः. This worthy was not only old but blind, and his request was “ स्वपौत्रं राजसिंहासनस्थितमीक्षितुमिच्छामीति.”

वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि ते नष्टम् ॥

Wishing to grow, you have destroyed your root. This is Prof. Cowell's rendering of the saying as it appears in the *Sarva-dars'anasangraha* (page 27 Bib. Ind., p. 33 Jivānanda):— ‘तथा च वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि ते नष्टं स्यादिति महत्कष्टमापन्नम्’ । In the *Vācaspatyam* the maxim is given in a slightly different form, and with quite another meaning. According to Tārānātha, it means “ Whilst seeking to obtain interest, the creditor loses [that and] the capital too.” “ वृद्धिमिष्टवतो मूलमपि विनष्टमिति न्यायः । वृद्धिर्धनप्रयोगेऽधमर्णात्प्राप्यांशभेदलाभः । तामिष्टवत उत्तमर्णस्याधमर्णदौष्ट्याद्यथा मूलं नश्यत्येवं यत्राभीष्टान्तरसंपादनाय प्रयतमानस्य मूलं नश्यति तत्रास्य प्रवृत्तिः ” ॥ See also *Khaṇḍamakhaṇḍakhādyā*, p. 31.

शरपुरुषीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the man and the arrow*. Vardhamāna explains this, as follows, in his comment on *Gaṇaratnamahodadhī* iii. 196:—“ शरश्च क्षिप्तः प्राकाराच्च पुरुष उथितः स तेन हतः । तत्तुल्यं शरपुरुषीयम् ” ॥ An arrow is discharged from a bow, and at the same moment a man rises up from behind a wall and is killed by it. It illustrates, therefore, a purely accidental and unforeseen occurrence, and must be classed with the अजाकृपाणीय, खल्वाटबिल्वीय, and others of a like nature.

शर्करोन्मज्जनीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the pebble and the [man's] emerging* [from the water]. This, like that immediately preceding, is found in Vardhamāna's work, and on the same page. He explains it thus:—“शर्करा च क्षिप्ता पुरुषस्य चोन्मज्जनं तत्तुल्यं शर्करोन्मज्जनीयम्” ॥ At the moment that the pebble is thrown, a man who has been diving or swimming emerges from the water and is struck by it. This, too, therefore, belongs to the अजाकृपाणीय and काकतालीय category.

शिरश्छेदेऽपि शतं न ददाति विंशतिपञ्चकं तु प्रयच्छ- तीति शाकटिकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the carter who would be beheaded rather than pay a hundred, but will at once give five score!* It occurs in the Pūrṇaprajña section of *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (page 71 of Bib. Ind. and page 83 of Jivānanda's) as follows:—“ननु प्रपञ्चस्य मिथ्यात्वमभ्युपेयते नासत्त्वमिति चेत्तदेतत्सोऽयं शिरश्छेदेऽपि शतं न ददाति विंशतिपञ्चकं तु प्रयच्छतीति शाकटिकवृत्तान्तमनुहरेन्मिथ्यात्वासत्त्वयोः पर्यायत्वादित्यलमतिप्रपञ्चेन” ॥ “If you say that you accept the falsity of the universe, but not its unreality, you are simply acting like the carter who would lose his head rather than pay a hundred pieces of money, but at once gives five score! For falsity and unreality are synonymous. But enough of prolixity.”

शीर्षे सर्पो देशान्तरे वैद्यः ॥

A snake in the head, and the doctor in another country! This occurs, in Prākṛit, in *Karpūramanjari* iv (page 100 of Kāvya-mālā edition). It is found in somewhat similar form in

Mudrārākṣha 1. 21, also in Prākṛit. The *chhāyā* is as follows. “उपरि घनं घनरदितं दूरे दयिता किमेतदापतितम् । हिमवति दिव्यौ-
षधयः शीर्षे सर्पः समाविष्टः” ॥

शुकनलिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of the parrot and the *Nalika*-tree. In *Udyoga-Parva* xvi. 42 we read “काकुदीकं शुकं नाकमक्षिसंतर्जनं तथा” । on which the commentator Nilakanṭha says:—“काकुदीकमित्यादयो-
ऽष्टावस्त्रजातयः ।...येन शुकनलिकान्यायेन अभयेऽपि भयदर्शिनो हयरथादिपादेषु
गाढं श्लिष्यन्ति तच्छुक्रं मोहनं नाम” ॥ I have met with it also in a
MS. (No. 233 of 1882-83 in Deccan College, Poona) of Nārā-
yaṇa's commentary on *Gopālotṭaratāpanīya-Upanishad* 8
(corresponding with 21 and 22 of *Bib. Ind.* edition), where,
expounding the words “यो हि वै कामेन कामान्कामयते &c.,” he
says:—“वास्तवं कर्तृभोक्तृत्वं बन्धमोक्षादिकमात्मनो नास्ति किंतु स्वकामप-
रिकल्पितं शुकनलिकान्यायेन” ॥

शृङ्गग्राहिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *seizing oxen by their horns*. That is, by way
of *specification*, and not in the sense of our proverb ‘Taking
the bull by the horns!’ This is very clearly put in Rāma-
krṣṇa's commentary on S'ankarānanda's *Ātmapurāṇa* iv.
561-2. The text runs thus:—“शास्त्रं चात्र प्रवृत्तं सत्यवृत्तिं कुरुते
द्विधा । विधानेन निषेधेन लोकदृष्टिसमाश्रयात् ॥ ५६१ ॥ शृङ्गग्राहिकया यदि
बोधयेत्तद्विधायकम् । यथा लोके करे तेऽस्ति फलमित्यादिभाषणम् ॥ ५६२ ॥”
On the latter verse, Rāmakṛṣṇa says:—“तत्र विधायकशास्त्रस्य
लक्षणं लौकिकमुदाहरणं चाह शृङ्गेति । शृङ्गस्य ग्रहणं यस्यां क्रियायां सा शृङ्ग-
ग्राहिका । संज्ञायामिति ण्युल् (Pān. 3. 3. 108-9) । यथा गोव्रजे का मदीया
गौरिति गोपः पृष्टः शृङ्गं गृहीत्वा गां प्रदर्शयेत्तथाबोधकं शास्त्रं विधायकमुच्य-
ते” ॥ The same sense is attached to the maxim in Nilakanṭha
on *Udyoga-Parva* XLV. 9 (“मदोऽष्टादशदोषः स स्यात्पुनरा यो-
ऽप्रकीर्तितः”) where we read:—“अप्रकीर्तित इति दमविरोधिन एव प्राति-

कृत्यादयो मददोषत्वेन सूचिता अपि शृङ्गग्राहिकया प्रकर्षेण विधिमुखेन न प्रोक्ता इत्यर्थः” ॥ A third instance of the employment of this maxim in the same sense is found in the metrical comment on *S'āṇḍilya-sūtra* 87 :—“न तावत्समवायेन भेदसंबन्धगौरवात् । शब्दानां समयोऽप्येवं शृङ्गग्राहिकया लघुः ” ॥ The passage is translated by Prof. Cowell as follows :—“ It will not do to hold that the connexion between the cause and its effect may be that called ‘Intimate relation,’ and not that called ‘Identity,’—because it is a much more cumbrous assumption than ours and involves the connexion of ‘difference;’ and by our own we easily get at the true meaning of the various S'ruti passages,—seizing them one by one, as oxen by their horns.” In a foot-note he adds :—“ That is, such passages as ‘Uktha is Brahman,’ ‘Prāṇa is Brahman’ &c. *S'ringagrāhikānyāya* is a proverb sometimes explained as ‘catching an unruly bull first by securing one horn and then the second,’ and sometimes, ‘driving many oxen into a stall, by seizing them one by one by their horns.’” Mr. F. W. Thomas has pointed out to me the शीर्षग्रहणन्याय which is quoted in the commentary on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍars'a* ii. 368. I think its usage must be similar to that of the above.

श्येनकपोतीयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the hawk and the pigeon*. Vardhamāna, in *Gaṇaratnamahodadhī* iii. 195, explains it in the following way :—“ श्येनकपोतयोरिव श्येनकपोतीयो दुर्योगः । यथा कपोतोऽतर्कितमागतेन श्येनेन गृहीतस्तथाकस्मिको यो दुर्योगः स एवमुच्यते” ॥ This must be classed therefore with शरपुरुषीय and others of a similar kind. We have a श्येनकपोतीयमुपाख्यानं given in the table of contents which forms the opening part of the *Mahābhārata*, and the story will be found in *Vanaparva* cxcvi. There is another in chapter cxxxi.

श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिन्यायः ॥

The maxim of the mother-in-law who said, 'Be off.' This quaint illustration appears in Sures'vara's *Naishkarmyasiddhi* i. 28, as follows:—"अभ्युपगताभ्युपगमाच्च श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिवद्भवतो निष्प्रयोजनः प्रलापः" ॥ "And since you now express agreement with that which we also acknowledge, your protracted discussion was as unreasonable as was the mother-in-law's saying [to the mendicant] 'Be off.'" The commentator, Jñānottama, explains this in the following manner:—"भिक्षामदते माणवकाय भिक्षां प्रत्याक्षणात्मानः स्नुषां भर्त्सयित्वा श्वश्रूः पुनस्तमाहूय समागते तस्मिन्नास्ति भिक्षा निर्गच्छेति तथैव प्रत्याचष्टे" ॥ "After abusing her daughter-in-law for refusing to give alms to a wandering mendicant, the mother-in-law called him back, and, when he had come, said to him, 'There are no alms, be off,' thus refusing also herself!"

सिंहावलोकनन्यायः ॥

The maxim of a lion's glance. This is based on a lion's habit of looking in front and behind, after killing its prey, to see if there is any rival to dispute possession! It is applied, says Tārānātha, where a word in a sentence is connected with what precedes and with that which follows it. The expression occurs four times in the *Taittirīya-Prâtisākhya*, namely in ii. 51, iv. 4, xiii. 3 and 15. Prof. Whitney remarks as follows on the first instance of its occurrence:—"The 'and' of this rule [वर्गवच्चैषु], the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series." It is found also in Nīlakaṇṭha's comment on *Vaṇa-parva* ccxxi. 1 (गुरुभिर्नियमैर्जातो भरतो नाम पावकः):—"सिंहावलोकनन्यायेन शंयोः पौत्रमूर्जपुत्रं भरतं स्तौति सार्धेन गुरुभिरिति" ॥ Also in *Bhāmati* 2. 3. 6 (page 473).

सूचीकटाहन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the needle and the boiler*. It is explained as follows in Molesworth's Marâṭhī dictionary:—"A phrase used as an illustration upon the occasion of two matters of which the one is superlatively simple and easy, or altogether insignificant and the other indefinitely greater, more difficult, or more important, arising at once to be done; and of which it is intended to intimate that the trifling one should be despatched first." It occurs in the opening part of chapter iv of *Kāvya-pradīpa*, and again on page 70 (*Kāvya-mālā* series). Also in the commentary on *Sāhitya-kaumudī* iv. 1, where the same *kārikā* is expounded.

स्थालीपुलाकन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the rice in the cooking-pot*. "In a cooking-pot all the grains being equally moistened by the heated water, when one grain is found to be well cooked the same may be inferred with regard to the other grains. So the maxim is used when the condition of the whole class is inferred from that of a part." (Apte's Sanskrit Dictionary). It is therefore clearly the equivalent of the saying "*Ex uno disce omnes*." After searching for many months for an instance of this *nyāya* in actual use, I suddenly came upon it in Jaimini 7. 4. 12. The *sūtra*, with a portion of Śābara's *bhāṣya*, is as follows:—"लिङ्गस्य पूर्ववत्त्वाच्चोदनाशब्दसामान्यादेकेनापि निरूप्येत यथा स्थालीपुलाकेन ॥.....एतन्न्यायपूर्वकं लिङ्गमेकत्रापि दृश्यमानं तुल्यन्यायानां सर्वेषां धर्मवत्तां ज्ञापयति । यथा स्थाल्यां तुल्यपाकानां पुलाकानामेकमुपमृष्ट्यान्येषामपि सिद्धतां जानाति." ॥

स्थूणानिखननन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the driving in of a post*. As a post is driven into the ground by repeated efforts, so a position is strengthened by the bringing forward of a succession of facts or arguments. It occurs three times in S'ankara's bhâshya on the *Vedântasûtras*, as follows:—“ पुनश्च जगज्जन्मादिहेतुत्वमीश्वरस्याक्षिप्यते स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन प्रतिज्ञातस्यार्थस्य दृढीकरणाय ” 2. 1. 34. “ आक्षेपपूर्विका हि परिहारोक्तिर्विवक्षितेऽर्थे स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन दृढां बुद्धिमुत्पादयति ” 3. 3. 53. “ सत्यं प्रसाधितं तस्यैव तु स्थूणानिखननवत्फलद्वारेणाक्षेपसमाधाने क्रियेते दाढ्याय ” 3. 4. 2.

स्वाङ्गं स्वव्यवधायकं न भवति ॥

One's own body does not hinder one. This is found at the end of the Akshapâda section of the *Sarvadars'anasangraha*, as follows:—“ न च स्वातन्त्र्यभङ्गः शङ्कनीयः स्वाङ्गं स्वव्यवधायकं न भवतीति न्यायेन प्रत्युत तन्निर्वाहात्. ” “ Nor need you object that this would interfere with God's own independence [as He would thus seem to depend on others' actions], since there is the well-known saying, 'One's own body does not hinder one;' nay rather it helps to carry out one's aims.” This is Professor Cowell's translation.

THE END.



ADDENDA.

अन्धपरम्परान्यायः ॥

The passage in the *Padamanjarî*, referred to on page 4, is as follows. It is part of an interesting discussion regarding different forms of a word, why some are considered correct and others not. “तत्र ये साधवस्ते शास्त्रेणानुशिष्यन्तेऽसाधुभ्यो विविक्ताः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययविभागेन ज्ञाप्यन्त इमे साधव इति । कथं पुनरिदमाचार्येण पाणिनिनावगतमेते साधव इति । आपिशलेन पूर्वव्याकरणेन । आपिशलिना तर्हि केनावगतम् । ततः पूर्वेण व्याकरणेन । यद्येवमन्धपरम्पराप्रसङ्गः । तद्यथा शुक्लं क्षीरमित्यन्धेनोक्ते केनेदमवगतमिति पृष्टो यदान्धान्तरं मूलं निर्दिशति सोऽप्यन्धान्तरं तदा नैतद्वचः शौक्ये प्रमाणं भवति तादृगेतत्” ॥

अरुन्धतीप्रदर्शनन्यायः ॥

A further reference to this maxim under the form स्थूलारुन्धतीन्याय is found in *Brahmasûtratâtmaparyavivarana* 1. 1. 12 (The Pandit, vol. iii, page 477) in the following sentence:— “यद्यप्यमुख्यप्रवाहे पाठस्तथापि स्थूलारुन्धतीन्यायेन मूषानिषिक्तद्रुततान्नादिप्रतिमावत्ततोऽन्तरान्तरतया पूर्वपूर्वेण समानमात्मेति ग्राह्यन्प्रतिपत्तिसौकर्यायात्मानमुपदिदेश” ॥

अर्के चेन्मधुविन्देत &c. ॥

Another interesting instance of the employment of this nyâya is found in Kumârila's *Tantravârtika* 1. 2. 17 as follows:— “यद्यल्पान्महतश्च कर्मणः समं फलं जायेत ततोऽर्के चेन्मधु विन्देतेत्यनेनैव न्यायेनाल्पेन सिद्धे महति न कश्चित्प्रवर्तेत” ॥ In the reading अर्के we have a third form of the word!

अर्धजरतीयन्यायः ॥

Another excellent illustration of the meaning of this maxim is given in the following passage of the *Brahmasūtratātmaparyavivaraṇa* 3. 4. 26. (The Pandit. vol iv, page 220):—“ब्रह्मविद्या स्वफलैः कर्माणि नापेक्षते तथा स्वोत्पत्तावपि नापेक्षते । अन्यथा कचिदपेक्षा कचिन्नेत्यर्धजरतीयत्वापत्तिरिति प्राप्ते आह सर्वापेक्षेति । नार्धजरतीयन्यायो योग्यतावशादेवैकस्यैव कार्यविशेषेष्वपेक्षानपेक्षयोरुपपत्तेः । यथा लाङ्गलवहनेऽनपेक्षितोऽश्वो रथवहनेऽपेक्ष्यते तद्वत्स्वोत्पत्तौ तु विद्या कर्मापेक्षते” ॥

अवयवशक्तेः समुदायशक्तिर्बलीयसी ॥

The strength of a community is greater than that of a member of it. Probably equivalent to 'Union is strength.' It occurs in *Kāvya-pradīpa*, page 398:—“अवयवशक्तेः समुदायशक्तिर्बलीयसीति न्यायात्” ॥

अश्मलोष्टन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the stone and clod of earth*. I have given the lexicographers' view of the meaning of this nyāya, under लोष्ट-प्रस्तरन्याय, but I now think that they are wrong. Is it not much more likely that the maxim is based on *Bṛhaddranyaka Upanishad* 1. 3. 7, “यथाश्मानमृत्वा लोष्टो विध्वंसेत्,” which S'ankara expounds thus:—“यथा लोकेऽश्मानं पाषाणमृत्वा गत्वा प्राप्य लोष्टः पांसु-पिण्डः पाषाणचूर्णनायाश्मनि निक्षिप्तः स्वयं विध्वंसेत् विस्त्रंसेत् विचूर्णीभवेत्” ॥? This is referred to in *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 6, as the अश्मलोष्टनिदर्शन, and it seems to remind one of the Scripture-saying “Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.”

एकवृन्तगतफलद्वयन्यायः ॥

The maxim of *two fruits attached to one stalk*. Used by writers on *Alankāra* to illustrate a particular kind of *Parono-*

masia, namely the coalescence of two meanings under one word. It was first pointed out to me by Mr. F. W. Thomas, Assistant Librarian to the India Office, he having met with it in the commentary on *Kāvyaāḍars'a* ii. 310. I have since found it in use in the *Alankārasarvasva*, *Kāvyaṣṭadīpa*, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, *Rasagangādhara*, *Alankāraḥastubha*, and *Sāhitya-kaumudī*, in each case under the figure श्लेष. The maxim finds a place in Marāṭhī literature also, and is regarded by Molesworth as equivalent to our proverb "Killing two birds with one stone."

काशकुशावलंबनन्यायः ॥

In *Tantravārtika* 1. 3. 18 (page 213) we have this maxim in the following couplet:—"अर्थवत्त्वं न चेज्जातं मुख्यैर्यस्य प्रयोजनैः । तस्यानुपङ्गिकेष्वशा कुशकाशावलंबिनी" ॥ I should like here to grasp some *kus'a* grass, and use it, not as a support for myself, but as a peg on which to hang a chronological note! In expounding *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 3. 3. 26, Ānandagiri quotes *Amarakoś'a* 2. 4 166 (अस्त्री कुशं कुथो दर्भः पवित्रमथ कच्छणम्) as follows:—"अत एवास्त्री कुशमित्यमरसिंहेनानुशिष्टम्." Does this throw any new light on the date of Amara? In his *History of Indian Literature* (page 230), Professor Weber tells us that the *Amarakoś'a* cannot be widely separated from those dictionaries which we know to belong to the eleventh, twelfth, and following centuries; whilst Professor Macdonell, in his recently issued *History of Sanskrit Literature* (page 433) assigns that work to about 500 A. D.

If I am right in supposing Ānandagiri to have been a disciple of the great S'ankara who died in 820 A. D., then the early part of the *eighth* century would be the *latest* date that could be assigned to Amara, allowing time for his *koś'a* to become an authority in the land; so here we have, at any rate, a *terminus ad quem* for him.

गङ्गुलिकाप्रवाहन्यायः ॥

This is very clearly explained in the *Kavyapradīpa* in the opening part of chapter viii (page 327).

चन्द्रचन्द्रिकान्यायः ॥

The maxim of *the moon and its light*. Used of two inseparable things. It is found in Ānandagiri's *S'ankaravijaya*, page 124 of Bib. Indica edition:—"अतः सर्वदेवकारणस्य रुद्रस्य या शक्तिश्चन्द्रचन्द्रिकान्यायेन तदुद्धोद्धरुपिणी स्वाधीनवल्लभेति प्रसिद्धा सैव भवानी" ॥

नहि खदिरगोचरे परशौ पलाशे द्वैधीभावो भवति ॥

I am not quite clear as to the drift of this saying. It occurs in *Bhāmātī* 2. 2. 28 (page 438 Bib. Ind.) in the following connection. "स्वरूपं विज्ञानस्यासत्याकारयुक्तं प्रमेयम् । प्रमेयप्रकाशनं प्रमाणफलं, तत्प्रकाशनशक्तिः प्रमाणम् । बाह्यवादिनोरपि वैभाषिकसौत्रान्तिकयोः काल्पनिक एव प्रमाणफलव्यवहारोऽभिमत इत्याह 'सत्यपि बाह्येऽर्थ' इति । भिन्नाधिकरणत्वे हि प्रमाणफलयोस्तद्भावो न स्यात् । नहि खदिरगोचरे परशौ पलाशे द्वैधीभावो भवति । तस्मादनयोरैकाधिकरण्यं वक्तव्यम्" ॥

नहि भवति कुण्डं बदरम् ॥

I should like more light on this saying also. It is found in *Bhāmātī* 1. 1. 4 (page 87) in the following sentence:—"आधाराधेयभावे एकाग्र्यत्वे वा न सामानाधिकरण्यं नहि भवति कुण्डं बदरमिति" ॥

पङ्कप्रक्षालनन्यायः ॥

When illustrating this maxim by quotations from Ānandagiri in *S'ankarabhāṣya* 4. 1. 16, I quite forgot that, in his exposition of *Brahmasūtra* 3. 2. 22, S'ankara had himself twice cited the second line of the couplet on which the nyāya is based, whilst

Ānandagiri in commenting thereon had mentioned the पङ्कप्रक्षाल-
नन्याय three times. Thanks to the invaluable *Indische Sprüche*,
I am able to point out that the couplet which I took from
Panchatantra is found also in *Vanaparva* (ii. 49 Bombay
edition) as follows:—“धर्मायै यस्य वित्तेहा वरं तस्य निरीहता । प्रक्षाल-
नाद्धि पङ्कस्य श्रेयो नस्पर्शनं नृणाम्” ॥ S'ankara quotes it as found
in the *Panchatantra*.

प्रदीपे प्रदीपं प्रज्वालय तमोनाशाय यतमानः ॥

*Trying to remove the dimness of a lamp by lighting an-
other.* Used of foolishly superfluous and misdirected effort.
It occurs in *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā*, page 294:—“लघोरूपाया-
त्साध्यसिद्धौ भवन्त्यां... गुरावुपाये प्रवर्तमानस्य तवैवेदं दोषोद्भावनं प्रदीपे
प्रदीपं प्रज्वालय तमोनाशाय यतमानस्येव पुंसः” ॥ In a footnote, the editor
says:—“प्रदीपं प्रज्वालय प्रदीपे तमोनाशाय यतमानस्य पुंस इवेत्यन्वयः.”

याचितमण्डनन्यायः ॥

I do not know the meaning of this maxim. It occurs in
Vaidyanātha's commentary on *Kāvya-pradīpa* v. 3. The text
is as follows:—“देवदत्त गामानयेत्यादिप्रयोजकवृद्धवाक्यं श्रुत्वा तदनन्तरं
प्रयोज्यवृद्धेन सास्त्रादिमन्तमर्थमानीयमानमालोक्य अयमेतद्विषयकैतत्क्रियागोच-
रकार्यताज्ञानवांस्तद्विषयकचेष्टावत्त्वात्तद्विषयकप्रवृत्तिमत्त्वाद्वा मद्बुद्धिं प्रयोज्य-
वृद्धस्य ज्ञानमनुमिमीते” ॥ The comment runs thus:—“अयमिति ।
प्रयोज्यवृद्ध इत्यर्थः । एतच्छब्देन गवादिरुच्यते । द्वितीयेन तेनानयनादिक्रिया ।
तथा च गोविषयकानयनक्रियागोचरकार्यताज्ञानवानित्यर्थः । क्रियाजनकप्रवृत्तेः
सविषयत्वात्तज्जन्यचेष्टाया अपि याचितमण्डनन्यायेन सविषयत्वम्” ॥

शृङ्गग्राहिकान्यायः ॥

The following quotation from *Bhāmati* 3. 2. 22 (page 566)
well illustrates the usage of this maxim:—“यथा गवादयो विषयाः
साक्षाच्छृङ्गग्राहिकया प्रतिपाद्यन्ते प्रतीयन्ते च नैवं ब्रह्म” ॥

ERRATA.

Page 13, line 4. For "fulfiling," say "fulfilling."

Page 31, line 3. Instead of "aurther," read "author."

Page 46, line 10. Italicize the word "of" twice.

ADDENDUM.

Page 24, line 2. After the full-stop insert the following:—

"It occurs also in *Jivanmuktiviveka*, page 101 (line 4 from bottom) of the edition in the Ânandâs'rama series."
